The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1886.

The Week.

THAT eminent expounder of the Constitution, Mr. Riddleberger, of Virginia, has come to the front in the Senate as the champion of the Republican doctrine that the upper branch of Congress has the right to demand of the President any papers bearing upon the cases of removed or suspended officials, and that it is the duty of the Executive to comply with such a demand. Mr. Pugh, of Alabama, has made answer for the Democrats with a series of resolutions, defining the respective prerogatives of President and Senate in matters of appointment and removal, and sustaining Mr. Cleveland in his refusal to furnish information as to his motives for exercising his power to remove or suspend an official. The issue thus joined will come up for discussion in open session, and the debate cannot fail to be a good thing for the country. It will be the first step toward that complete publicity regarding the disposition of the offices which the country is resolved to have. We observe that Mr. Edmunds on Tuesday repeated his familiar lecture to his colleagues about their wickedness in letting the newspapers know what is said and done about public business in executive session. The insistence of the Vermont Senator upon strict observance of this mummery is only another illustration of that pettiness of temperament which seems to be aggravated year by year, until it often counterbalances his great ability.

As we understand it, while the President stoutly maintains that the Senate has no right, in its capacity of enjoying certain executive prerogatives, to ask him for papers regarding a suspension which it proposes to consider in secret session, he would interpose no objection to furnishing any information desired for discussion and action in open legislative session. In other words, what Mr. Cleveland insists upon in this matter is publicity, and he is quite right. The consideration of nominations in secret sessions has been fruitful of abuses of every sort. There is not a single sound argument in favor of it. Senator Logan rightly declared the other day that the people have just as much right to know what is said and done in regard to nominations as in regard to legislation. He might have gone still further, and declared with perfect truth that the people are much more deeply interested just now in learning the principles upon which the Senate treats nominations than they are in the greater part of its ordinary legislation. We trust that General Logan will continue to demand the reform which he has championed, and we wish we had more faith than we have that he will carry it through. We trust also that the Republicans will take this issue about suspensions into open session, and get all the facts before the country. Publicity about the whole business of filling the offices would do more to secure the establishment of a thoroughgoing reform than any other thing. The Republicans in the Senate will do the country a great service if they will insist upon publicity. But their treatment of the suspension issue thus far has been so plainly an attempt to secure partisan advantage that we have not much confidence that they will do this.

Senator Sherman has introduced a bill to discontinue the coinage of silver dollars, and to substitute in place of such coinage the purchase by the Treasury of an equal amount of silver bars, upon which may be issued coin certificates having the same legal qualities as the present silver certificates. Such a measure would be preferable to the existing law only in two respects. It would save the cost of coining, and it would introduce a new Chinese puzzle into our monetary system, which would probably have the effect politically of mystifying so many people that the Sherman bill would itself be soon repealed. The result would be that both the Bland Act and the Sherman Act would be out of the way, and of course that would be a good thing. But Bland and Beck are too shrewd not to see all this as well as Mr. Sherman himself. We do not look for any votes for the measure which would not be given for the repeal of the Bland Act pure and simple.

The Boston *Herald* has been having a curious controversy with its filthy and mendacious contemporary the Boston *Journal* — the only morning paper in that city, by its own confession, which ventured to support Blaine in 1884 —touching Blaine's attitude toward silver. The *Herald* said he had in the Senate, in 1878, "favored a silver dollar containing 425 grains of silver in place of the standard coin of 412½ grains, to have unlimited coinage, and be an unlimited legal tender." This the *Journal* pronounced "a deliberate and wanton perversion of truth," a term which it often uses as synonymous with undoubted fact. The *Herald* now quotes from a bill which Blaine introduced in February, 1878, and which he said contained "three very simple provisions":

> "That the dollar shall contain 425 grains of standard silver, shall have unlimited coinage, and be an unlimited legal tender."

This was Blaine all over. Everything about him is "unlimited"—gold, silver, brass, stocks, and bonds. The *Herald* wonders what the *Journal* will say now.

A good many of the religious journals have hastily endorsed the extraordinary anti-Mormon measure which was recently rushed through the Senate, which proposes practically to confiscate the property of the church, by authorizing the President to appoint trustees who shall control it. The *Christian Union*, however, has taken time to examine into the matter, and finds an objection to the measure, from the religious point of view, which is even more serious than the purely secular objections. It thus states its reasons for opposing the measure:

> "If Congress has a right to appoint trustees of a religious corporation in the Territories, by a parity of reasoning the State Legislatures would have a right to appoint similar trustees in the States, and there would be nothing to prevent a legislative body governed by infidels from putting all church property into secular hands, or, for that matter, a Protestant or a Roman Catholic legislative body from dealing in a similar manner with the trustees of churches of an opposite faith."

The *Christian Union* hopes to see a "braver and fuller discussion" of this bill in the House than it received in the Senate. The hasty passage of such a measure is one of the most discreditable things of which the upper branch has been guilty for a long time.

The opponents of the Bell Telephone suit are making a great clamor over the pecuniary interest which Attorney-General Garland has in the setting aside of the Bell patent, and are charging that this is really the main motive of the Government's action; that Secretary Lamar, while having no pecuniary interest in the matter, has yielded to the personal influence of his associate, Mr. Garland, in bringing the suit. Clamor of this kind would have no weight with the public were it not based upon a certain amount of truth. Unfortunately there is only too much truth in this instance. The relations of the Attorney-General to a telephone company seriously interfere with his usefulness as a public officer in all matters relating to telephone litigation. He is the self-confessed owner of a very large block of stock in a rival company. Documents have been published which show that he acquired this stock while he was in the Senate, and that he was given it because the promoters of the enterprise believed he would be useful to them. His own letters show that he not only "saw various channels in which he could be useful," but that he was useful in many of them. When he became Attorney-General, he was asked to bring a suit in the name of the Government to test the validity of the Bell patent. He declined to do this, as he subsequently explained in a letter to President Cleveland, because he was "disabled by being a stockholder and the attorney for the company in whose name it was intended to make the application." This refusal was given some time last summer. A few weeks later, Mr. Garland left Washington for a vacation in Arkansas, and soon after his departure it was announced that the suit which he had declined to bring had been granted to the applicants by the Solicitor-General. The popular outcry against the proceeding was very great, and the Attorney-General's relations to the company bringing the suit were fully exposed. The President called upon him for an explanation, and it was given in a long communication dated October 8. In it Mr. Garland admitted the truth about his stock in the rival company, explained, as cited above, his reasons for declining to grant the suit, and declared that the Solicitor-General's permission had been obtained without his knowledge or consent. The President then intimated very plainly to the Solicitor-General that he had better revoke his permission for the suit and refer the question to the Interior Department, and this was done. Secretary Lamar's decision to allow the suit to be brought has caused great surprise, and has revived the whole subject of the Attorney-General's relations to the question.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Defence of Mr. Lamar's action may be possible, and if it is it should not be delayed. There is no light to be found in his official announcement of his decision, for he gives no opinion upon the merits of the case. It was very evident that he had not carefully examined the subject, for he states, as a reason for bringing the suit in the name of the United States, that no private suit could avail to set aside a patent which had been fraudulently obtained, whereas the Revised Statutes (section 4920) expressly provide that this issue can be raised in a suit brought for infringement. If he was not influenced by his personal regard for the Attorney-General and the other eminent Southern gentlemen who are also stockholders in the Pan-Electric Company, he should make that fact as plain as possible. The great pity of it all is that no explanation can free the Administration from more or less scandal in the matter. Mr. Garland is the head of the Department of Justice, and if the suit is to be tried in the Government's name, his Department will have charge of the prosecution. That he will not take charge of it personally does not materially lessen the objection. He owns a half million dollars' worth of stock in the Pan-Electric Company, or one-tenth of its whole capital. The company has eight licensed branch companies, with an ostensible capital of $40,000,000, of which 40 per cent. belongs to the Pan-Electric Company, and one-tenth of this 40 per cent. belongs to Mr. Garland. If the Bell patent were to be set aside, Mr. Garland's interest, which is now little more than paper capital, would become enormously valuable, and this contingency will be certain to affect the conduct of every man associated with him. Under these circumstances neither he nor a department controlled by him ought to have any connection with a suit of such great importance and brought under such suspicious circumstances. It would not be sufficient for him to dispose of his stock altogether, for his former relations would be certain to affect his conduct. We are frank to say that there is only one of two courses for the Government to follow, and that is either to order the abandonment of the suit or to call for the resignation of Mr. Garland. His continuance in office under the present conditions is doing the Administration irreparable injury.

While it is doubtful if much will be accomplished by the inquiry which the House has authorized concerning the Government expenditures in the proposed telephone suit, the mere fact that a Democratic House has felt obliged to take notice of the subject is a striking illustration of the impression which the telephone scandal is creating. The Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, which is to make the inquiry, is not a remarkably impressive body of men. It is composed of Gibson, of West Virginia; Hammond, of Georgia; Seymour, of Connecticut; Ward, of Illinois; Milliken, of Maine; Hanback, of Kansas; and Sawyer, of New York. Of these Mr. Hanback is the author of the resolution under which the inquiry is to be made. He says he is determined to have the whole matter thoroughly investigated, but the terms of the resolution limit the inquiry to the expenses incurred by the Department relative to the suit. They do not give the Committee authority to inquire into the Attorney-General's relations to the Pan-Electric Company, which constitute the real ground for the present scandal. The question is not how much money the Government has spent in allowing the suit to be brought, but upon the impropriety of allowing it to be brought at all under an Attorney-General who has personal and pecuniary interests in the result.

The House on Monday, by a vote of exactly three to one, passed the bill increasing the pensions of widows and dependent relatives of soldiers from $8 to $12 a month. This was to have been expected, and as it is estimated that the change will add only about $6,000,000 to the annual pension roll, the country will probably not grumble. The amendment removing the limitation of the Arrears Act, which the Pension Commissioner says would cost the Treasury more than $300,000,000, was ruled out of order, but its advocates mean to push it as a separate proposition later, and will carry it through unless public sentiment pronounces strongly against it.

The decision of the Supreme Court in the Virginia coupon cases, announced on Monday, is another great triumph of honesty over fraud. The State of Virginia, to cut the matter short, made the coupons on its bonds receivable for taxes, and then, under the guidance of the "readjusters," repudiated them, first by requiring that every holder of a coupon who offered it for taxes should prove its genuineness, so as to make their use intolerably troublesome and expensive; and at last by open and brazen declaration of their worthlessness. The Court of Appeals of the State sustained this swindle, but the Supreme Court of the United States has put an extinguisher on it. The whole affair shows that Mahone did not spring up on stony ground. He was produced by a rotten public sentiment.

The legislative row at Columbus during the past week was a disgrace to the State of Ohio. At the October election the Cincinnati Democrats managed to count in their candidates for Senators and Representatives in Hamilton County by tampering with the true returns of the votes. The forgery by which the narrow Democratic majority was secured has been clearly exposed, and at least one honest man among the company who thus secured certificates has openly confessed that he and his fellows had no right to the seats which they claimed. The job was put through by the corrupt McLean gang in a desperate attempt to manufacture a Democratic majority in the Legislature and elect the *Enquirer* editor to the United States Senate. It failed, but it rendered the Legislature uncomfortably close, the Democrats having three majority in the Senate and the Republicans six in the House. The natural course would have been for the Republican candidates from Cincinnati to claim the seats of the Democratic incumbents in each branch, and for the Senate and House to institute a thorough investigation in a deliberate way. This course would doubtless have been pursued but for the complication of the Senatorship. The Republicans had three majority in the whole Legislature, but Mr. Sherman's friends had good reason to fear that two or three members of the party were so much opposed to his reëlection that they would vote for some other Republican and elect him with Democratic help, if indeed they might not go so far as to support a Democrat outright. The Republican majority in the House therefore concluded to turn out the ten Democratic representatives from Cincinnati in short order, and the Republican contestants were admitted after a hasty and brief investigation. It was theoretically an abuse of power by the Republicans; but as, practically, the Democrats had no valid claim to the seats, the public was disposed to excuse the performance.

Senator Sherman was reëlected, and no excuse was left for any haste or heat in settling the contested seats in the upper branch. But the Republicans had come to regard brute force as a good weapon, while the rather harsh treatment of the Cincinnati Democrats in the House had put the Senators from that city in an ugly frame of mind. The Senate consisted of twenty Democrats and seventeen Republicans, and was presided over by the Republican Lieutenant-Governor, whose duties as presiding officer are not clearly defined by the State Constitution. The Democrats took it for granted that he would claim great powers, and attempted to restrain him by establishing a set of rules which made him only a figurehead. The question of the right of the four Cincinnati Senators to their seats came up; the Lieutenant-Governor held that the sitting Democratic members had no right to vote upon it; the seventeen Republicans sustained the Lieutenant-Governor; the sixteen Democrats whose seats are not contested, with the four from Cincinnati, denied his power to make such a ruling; and confusion worse confounded ensued. After some days of rival Senates and narrow escape from bloodshed, the sensible members of both parties got together, and agreed upon a compromise, providing for a fair investigation by a properly constituted committee, whose report is to be accepted as final. If this proves to be the issue of the controversy, the Senators will only have adopted, after a disgraceful squabble, the course which they ought to have pursued in the beginning. It is impossible to feel much sympathy for either party to the quarrel. The Democrats indisputably have no moral claim to the seats, but the Republicans would have made their case infinitely stronger if they had been content to go more slowly.

A man who fought to preserve the Union should have a right to share in governing the country which he helped to save; yet there is one State where a large number of veterans are to this day under some circumstances by law debarred from voting. A bill was introduced in the Rhode Island Legislature last week which proposes the submission to the electors of the State, at the April election this year, of a Constitutional amendment extending the right of suffrage to all Union soldiers and sailors of foreign birth resident in the State who served during the war of the Rebellion. Rhode Island still maintains the property qualification so far as foreigners are concerned, and no citizen of this

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class, however meritorious his services, can vote unless he has a freehold. Something over one-fifth of the State's population in 1860 was of foreign birth, and among the 23,699 men furnished to the Union army during the war there must have been some thousands of foreigners, the survivors of whom have never acquired the right to vote, although no freehold qualification is required of a native who had not courage enough to join the army. Rhode Island sticks obstinately to old ways, but it hardly seems possible that a majority of those who now enjoy the right to vote will longer deny it to men whose assistance to the State was needed and welcomed in the greatest crisis of her history.

Senator Edmunds has persuaded the Judiciary Committee to report adversely upon the nomination of Mr. Merrick as Judge of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, on the ground that he is too old, having reached his sixty-sixth year when he was named for the position last spring. It will be interesting to see what stand will be taken upon this question by sundry of Mr. Edmunds's associates—like his colleague, Mr. Morrill, for instance, who has recently entered upon a new term of six years at the age of seventy-five; Mr. Evarts, who expects to deliver his inaugural address as President in 1889, just after completing his seventy-first year; Mr. Sawyer, who has the pipes all laid for his reelection by the Wisconsin Legislature next winter in his seventy-first year; Mr. Dawes, who is running for reelection in Massachusetts next year, when he will be well along in his seventy-first year, as "the Indian's friend," and vindicating his claim by dashing about over the Western country every summer; and many other Senators on each side of the chamber, who are Judge Merrick's seniors, but are busily scheming for another term of office. Mr. Edmunds is sound enough in holding that, as a rule, it is better not to appoint a man to a judgeship after he has passed sixty, because he is unlikely to serve long; but with so many examples as we have, from the Supreme Court down, of men able to do good service on the bench after they have reached seventy, it would be unjust not to make an exception in the case of a man like Mr. Merrick, who is vigorous in body and mind. Old age is not an absolute term, but a matter of individual constitution. Mr. Edmunds himself is only fifty-eight, but he manifests more of the querulousness usually associated with advancing years than many Senators who are a decade older.

The correspondence touching the authenticity of the remark attributed by General James B. Fry to General Sherman, that, "had C.F. Smith lived, Grant would have disappeared to history after Donelson," proves that General Sherman did use that language in the identical words quoted. The context shows, also, that the words were used in connection with the misunderstanding that then existed between Grant and Halleck, concerning which General Sherman says, "I had the highest possible opinion of Halleck's knowledge and power, and never blamed him for mistrusting Grant's ability." The statement that "had C. F. Smith lived Grant would have disappeared to history after Donelson," contains nothing derogatory to General Grant, and nothing out of the range of probability, and nothing inconsistent with the spirit of true friendship between Grant and Sherman. If Grant had been definitely superseded after Donelson and had retired to Galena, as he was on the point of doing after Shiloh, and would have done but for Sherman's entreaty, he would have "disappeared to history." Evidently this thought was in General Sherman's mind when he wrote his hasty note to Colonel Scott, from which General Fry quoted. The contingency which, together with Sherman's personal intervention, kept Grant in the army at that critical juncture, was the death of General C. F. Smith, who would unquestionably have been put in command of the Army of the Tennessee if he had lived—not through any act of Sherman's, but in consequence of the then prevailing distrust of Grant's ability. General Sherman says that he never blamed Halleck for sharing in this distrust. Nor is Halleck to be fairly blamed.

Of course, General Sherman had forgotten that he used those words in his letter to Col. Scott. The question arises, Why did not General Fry tell him at once what his authority was for the quotation? The answer is not far to seek. General Sherman never asked General Fry that question, but asked a third party to find out for him. Military men are apt to be punctilious, and when an officer finds himself treated cavalierly by a brother officer, he is excusable for standing on his dignity. This is what General Fry did and had a right to do. If General Sherman had addressed him a respectful inquiry asking what his authority was, he would probably have received a respectful and categorical answer. If he had not received such a response, General Fry would have put himself as much in the wrong as General Sherman now is.

One of the singular things about boycotting in this country is the equanimity with which its victims submit to attempts to extort money from them by the boycotters. The New Haven *Morning News* is at this writing undergoing persecution of this sort from the "Trades Council," of New Haven, because it will not discharge all its present compositors, and employ others furnished to it by the Typographical Union and pay $500 as the cost of its own humiliation. It refused this and proposed arbitration, which the Council refused, and the "Joint Boycott Committee" then announced in a letter to the *Morning News* Company that, in addition to the "indemnity" previously demanded, "it was decided at a meeting of the Committee held yesterday that they should be charged $50 per week after the present week as a just share of the expense incidental to the boycott." Now the Typographical Union has a perfect right to strike, or order a strike, or make any demands it pleases as regards the dismissal or employment of compositors; but unless the law of Connecticut differs from that of most other civilized communities, demanding money as the price of desisting from attempts to injure or interfere with a man's business is there a criminal offence. In this State it is "blackmail," under the Penal Code, to threaten "to do any injury to any person or any property in order to extort or gain any money or other property." Surely this or something like it must be the law in Connecticut too. If it be, why does not the *Morning News* Company have this "Joint Committee" arrested and brought to justice?

Parnell could not have taken the Irish Secretaryship, as it was rumored he would consent to do, without losing all influence in Ireland, so familiar have the people there been in times past with the practice of stopping the mouths of Irish Parliamentary patriots by giving them office. Moreover, he is, as he himself says, pledged to opposition to all legislation dictated by "alien feelings," which legislation for Ireland in London is and must continue to be. In fact, this phrase contains the real strength of the home-rule position. Legislation in our day to produce content has to be the work of men who both understand and sympathize with the people for whom they legislate. In fact, this may be called one of the essentials of modern government This sort of legislation, Englishmen, it has been fully proved, no matter how much pity they may feel for the Irish or how earnestly they may desire to serve them; cannot furnish. In fact, an Englishman filled to the chin with justice and pity for people whom he looks down upon, is probably one of the most exasperating rulers in the world. His subjects, no matter how much he does for them, never get over the desire to hit him with something. This really gives a touch of pathos to the position of the Liberal party toward Ireland at this moment.

Since the adjournment of Congress, Mexican politics have worn a calmer exterior, but it is evident that a great deal of intriguing is going on. Governors and generals are unexpectedly found in the capital conferring with the President; Gonzales himself comes to look after his interests on the spot; and the rumor is renewed that Lerdo, whose name is still one to conjure with in Mexico, is about to return from his exile in New York to dictate terms for himself and his faction. The best opinion seems to be that the quarrel between Diaz and Gonzalez has been adjusted, on the basis of an agreement by the latter to abandon all pretensions to another term as President, leaving the Administration to arrange the succession, on condition that all the proceedings against him for misuse of public funds be at once dropped. It is said to be in pursuance of this compact that Gonzalez has so passively allowed the work of displacing his followers in Nuevo Leon, Tamaulipas, and Coahuila to go on. The Government is far from having extricated itself from the financial difficulties bequeathed to it by the former Administration. It is vigorously insisting upon the rigid execution of the funding laws of June 22, as affording the only hope of permanent relief. Protests against that legislation, petitions for its amendment, and requests for exemption from its operation are pouring in upon the President, but he remains firm. He is reported recently to have said that the Mexicans had hitherto only known what it was to make laws, but that he was now about to teach them what it was to obey the laws.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

[WEDNESDAY, January 26, to TUESDAY, February 2, 1886, inclusive.]

DOMESTIC.

THE President, through the Attorney-General, on Friday refused to transmit to the Senate in executive session the papers with reference to the suspension from office of the District Attorney for the Southern District of Alabama, because "it is not considered that the public interests will be promoted."

The Democratic Senators in a caucus on Saturday unanimously resolved "that we approve the action of the President communicated to the Senate through Attorney-General Garland, in his letter of January 29, 1886, and that we cordially support the Executive therein." A Democratic Senator, speaking of the caucus, said that it was harmonious; that no suggestion of opposition was made in any quarter; that the Democratic Senators intend by this resolution to endorse the general policy of the President, and do not limit their approval to the answer from the Attorney-General; and that their decision is to apply to the issue which is now made between the Executive and the Senate.

Attorney-General Garland's letter was laid before the Senate in executive session on Monday. Mr. Edmunds moved that the letter be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, of which he is Chairman, and that that Committee be given authority to report its opinion of the matter in open session. Mr. Hoar suggested that the letter should be sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, of which he is Chairman. The matter went over on an objection by Senator Butler (Dem., S. C.).

The controversy between the Senate and the President was brought up in the open Senate on Tuesday morning by a resolution introduced by Mr. Riddleberger (Readj., Va.) in these words: "Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Executive of the United States is not restricted by the Constitution or law in removing or suspending appointees; that the Senate has no constitutional right to require that reasons shall be given for said removals or suspensions. But it is the right of the Senate to call for any papers relating to the conduct of suspended appointees, or the qualifications and fitness of all persons whose names are presented to the Senate for confirmation or rejection; and that it is the duty of the Executive to comply with all demands for the same." Mr. Riddleberger said his object was to secure a discussion in open session. The resolution, which represents the Republican position, went over for one day. Mr. Pugh (Dem., Ala.) also introduced a resolution designed to state the Democratic position as to the relative powers of the President and Senate. The purport of it was that it would be an encroachment upon the constitutional rights of the Executive to furnish any information that could be used directly or indirectly in the matter of suspensions or removals.

The Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will report adversely on the nomination of Morris R. Thomas, of Maryland, to be Indian Inspector.

Senator Sherman on Thursday introduced a bill to amend the Coinage Act of February 28, 1878. It provides for the immediate suspension of the coining of the Bland dollar, and authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase "silver bullion in bars, not less than nine-tenths fine, at the market price thereof, not less than 2,000,000 ounces Troy per month, nor more than 4,000,000 ounces Troy per month, and he shall issue in payment therefor coin certificates of the United States in denominations of not less than ten dollars each, corresponding with the denominations of the United States notes; and the bullion so purchased shall be retained in the Treasury for the security and for the payment of the same; and the amount of such certificates at any time outstanding shall not exceed the cost of the bullion purchased by such certificates, and the certificates thus issued shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and when so received may be reissued; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem in coin the same certificates on their presentation for redemption at the office of the Assistant Treasurer of the United States in the city of New York, in sums not less than $50. Any holder of standard silver dollars or gold coin of the United States, or gold bullion at its mint value, may deposit the same with the Treasurer or any Assistant Treasurer of the United States in sums of not less than $10, and receive coin certificates therefor similar in denomination and legal effect to the certificates provided for in the preceding section. The coin deposited for or representing the certificates shall be retained in the Treasury for the payment of the same on demand." This bill is understood to be an attempt to give effect to some of the main provisions of the Warner bill.

The argument upon the bill for an international copyright was begun before the Senate Committee on Patents on Thursday morning. The American Copyright League was represented by Mr. A. G. Sedgwick, Dr. Howard Crosby, J. B. Gilder, George Walton Greene, and Mark Twain. On Friday Mr. James Russell Lowell spoke strongly in support of the law.

The House of Representatives on Wednesday passed the bill declaring forfeited certain land grants to the States of Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana to aid in the construction of rail roads, amended by providing that the lands restored to the public domain shall be subject to entry and settlement under the provisions of the Homestead Law only; if, however, sales of any such lands have heretofore been made by the United States, such sales are confirmed.

The House of Representatives on Monday passed the following resolution: "That the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice be empowered to make full inquiry into any expenditure on the part of the Government relative to the rights of the Bell and Pan-Electric Telephone Companies; and for the purpose of this investigation, and to the end that the people may be fully advised, the Committee is granted the right to send for persons and papers—all expenses to be audited and accounted from approved vouchers, and when so approved to be paid out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated." Some of the Arkansas members were indiscreet enough to seem to put themselves in opposition to the inquiry; but Mr. Morrison asserted his leadership, shrewdly asked for unanimous consent to have the resolution considered, and it was passed.

By a vote of 198 to 66 the House on Monday passed the bill increasing the pensions of widows and dependent survivors of Union soldiers from $8 to $12 a month.

The Pensions Committee of the House instructed its Chairman on Monday to report the Mexican Pension Bill at the earliest opportunity. The bill gives $8 monthly to all Mexican soldiers and their widows.

The Secretary of the Navy has received information from the Pacific Mail Steamship Company that another revolution is threatened on the Isthmus of Panama. Rear-Admiral Jouett, commanding the North Atlantic Station, was on Friday directed by telegraph to remain at Aspinwall with the *Tennessee* for the present.

Mr. Maynard, Second Comptroller of the Treasury, has made a report upon the adjustment and settlement of the accounts of the disbursing officers of the Signal Service, in which he asserts that many apparently irregular and unauthorized disbursements have been made.

The public-debt statement for January shows a reduction of $8,672,553 81.

The Supreme Court of the United States has reversed the decision of the Court of Appeals of Virginia, and decided that the tender of coupons in payment of taxes is legal.

Despatches were received on Thursday, dated Nacori, Sonora, Mexico, January 21, from Lieutenant Maus, United States Army. They say that the troops under Captain Crawford, on January 11, surrounded and attacked an Indian camp fifty miles southeast of Nacori. A two-hours' running fight took place, and a number of Indians were wounded, but all escaped. The hostiles sent word that they wished to hold a conference. While the troops were in camp awaiting the time fixed for the conference, they were attacked by 154 Mexican soldiers. Efforts were made to let them know that the troops were Americans and friends. Captain Crawford and Lieutenant P. Maus advanced to talk with them, when a volley was fired. Captain Crawford was shot in the head, and died on the 18th. The Mexican fire was returned by the scouts of Captain Crawford's command, but only sufficiently to keep the Mexicans at a distance. The firing lasted half an hour, when Lieutenant Maus succeeded in having a talk with the officer in command of the Mexicans, their captain having been killed. He was told the Americans were taken for hostiles owing to the darkness. Other reports say that the attack was intentional. The Mexicans lost four killed and five wounded.

The following day two squaws from the hostiles, who had escaped, came to Lieutenant Maus to treat for terms. He refused to talk with them and also refused to talk with two bucks, who followed soon after. Geronimo, the head chief, and Natchez, another chief, then appeared to make terms. They said they were utterly discouraged, and were tired of being hunted from rock to rock. Lieutenant Maus would consent to nothing but an unconditional surrender. The chiefs then agreed to meet General Crook at a point on the line between Mexico and the United States. They sent hostages to the American camp. The hostiles are now on their way to the place of meeting with General Crook, and expect to reach there by February 4th. The party numbers twenty-two bucks, and is supposed to comprise all the renegades.

The third annual report of the New York Civil-Service Commission to the Governor was presented to the Assembly on Wednesday morning. It gives the following statistics: Number of persons in the service of the State subject to civil-service regulations 15,179, including 7,355 in New York, and 1,931 in Brooklyn. During the year, 4,822 persons were examined and 2,725 appointed. The Commissioners say the importance of securing the best qualified physicians for health officers is apparent, but regret that the provisions made to prevent the appointment of incompetent and inexperienced men for reasons of political or personal favoritism have not been as effective as they should have been. The whole number of health officers in the State is 1,282. Only 241 have been appointed in conformity with the rules.

The New York Senate on Wednesday passed a resolution for an investigation by the Railroad Committee of the granting of the Broadway franchise in this city. The vote was twenty-five to five (four Republicans and one Democrat.)

The trial of General Shaler, President of the Board of Health of this city, for accepting a bribe was concluded on Thursday by the jury disagreeing.

The aggregate resources of the savings banks of this city at the commencement of the present year were $301,000,000. The amount due depositors was $256,000,000, an increase in deposits of $11,000,000 during the year. Total surplus on market values at the same date was $45,000,000. The number of depositors or open accounts was 640,000. During the year the sum of $8,300,000 of interest has been credited to depositors. The amount deposited

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during the year was $75,000,000 and the amount withdrawn $71,000,000.

The Massachusetts Senate on Friday rejected the order to investigate the sale by the Governor and Council of the bonds of the New York and New England Railroad held by the State. The vote was 19 to 7, four of the eleven Democrats voting with the Republicans.

Professor Thompson, of the University of Pennsylvania, has been engaged by Yale College to deliver a course of lectures on political economy from the protectionist point of view. It is said that his salary is paid by a few Connecticut gentlemen who do not believe in Professor Sumner's free-trade views.

David R. Atchison died at his home in Missouri on January 26, aged seventy-nine. He was United States Senator from that State from 1843–1855, and was twice President *pro tem.* of that body. While holding that position in 1849 it was said that he was practically President for one day, Sunday, March 4th; President Taylor not being inaugurated until March 5th. At the outbreak of the war he was active in organizing the Confederate forces in Missouri, and took part in several battles.

Henry P. Kidder, senior partner of the banking firm of Kidder, Peabody & Co., of Boston and New York, died in this city on Thursday afternoon, aged sixty-three years. He was one of the Overseers of Harvard College.

Mrs. Bayard, the wife of the Secretary of State, died in Washington on Sunday morning. Her health had greatly improved since last summer, but the death of her daughter caused a shock which resulted in brain trouble. She became unconscious on Saturday and did not rally.

Gen. David Hunter (retired) died in Washington on Tuesday, aged eighty-four. He commanded the Departments of Kansas and the South during the civil war, and held other important positions. On May 9, 1862, he issued his famous proclamation declaring the slaves of Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina free, by virtue of martial law. This proclamation the President annulled on May 19. He was brevetted Major-General in 1865, and retired the following year

John D. Philbrick, Superintendent of the Boston public schools from 1856 to 1874, and before that State Superintendent of Public Schools for Connecticut, died at his home in Danvers, Mass., on Tuesday morning, after a lingering illness. He had been engaged in educational work from the time of his graduation from Dartmouth College, in the class of '42, and was among the most prominent teachers in the country.

FOREIGN.

The British Cabinet crisis remained unsettled for several days after the Tory defeat. It was thought at one time that the Queen would summon Lord Hartington to form a Cabinet, but on Friday morning the London *Standard*, Conservative, announced that the Queen would unquestionably summon Mr. Gladstone.

The Queen on Friday summoned Mr. Gladstone to a conference at Osborne in regard to forming a Cabinet. Mr. Gladstone left London on Monday, and was greeted with enthusiasm on his journey. He received the personal command of the Queen to form a Cabinet.

A trustworthy forecast of Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet, published on Tuesday, asserts that Lord Northbrook will be Viceroy for Ireland, Mr. John Morley Chief Secretary for Ireland, and Sir William Vernon Harcourt Home Secretary. Lord Northbrook will not have a seat in the Cabinet. Mr. Gladstone will be Chancellor of the Exchequer, combining this office with the Premiership. Mr. H. C. E. Childers will be Minister of War, Sir Farrer Herschell probably Lord Chancellor, Lord Viscount Hampden, Lord of the Privy Seal, and Earl Spencer very likely Viceroy of India. Mr. Chamberlain was designated First Lord of the Admiralty, but has declined the post. Lord Richard Grosvenor will have an office, possibly that of Postmaster-General. Mr. G. O. Trevelyan will be President of the Local Government Board, and Mr. Mundella President of the Board of Trade. The reason of the Queen's delay in summoning Mr. Gladstone has generally been stated to be her dread of home rule. This is contradicted. Her Majesty's hesitation was caused by fear of Granville again being Foreign Secretary at this critical moment of European politics. He will not be, but the Foreign Secretary will most probably be Earl Rosebery, who is personally on the best terms with Bismarck.

It is authoritatively announced in London that Lord Hartington will not join the new Cabinet. The *News* believes that he will remain neutral and will not seek to trammel Mr. Gladstone.

The Dublin *Freeman's Journal* on Monday said it had reason to believe that Mr. Gladstone has agreed with Mr. Parnell to join forces in Parliament for the passage of a bill which shall establish a native Parliament in Dublin to deal with Irish affairs; the new Legislature to be so constituted as to add to the present safeguards of the integrity of the Empire and the rights of the Crown.

Mr. Parnell, it is asserted, will firmly demand that the local government question be settled by Parliament before the land question, or that both subjects be discussed together.

Mr. Parnell was recently asked whether under any circumstances he would accept the Chief Secretaryship for Ireland. His reply was: "Certainly not. To administer any law an honest man must be in sympathy with it and believe it to be a just and righteous law. Now, I am not in sympathy with the English rule of Ireland, but believe it to be both unjust in itself and prompted by alien feelings. Believing this, under no possible circumstances would I have part or lot in administering it."

The Duke of Westminster has retracted his recent charge against Parnellites of squandering Irish donations in debauchery. He says he is unable positively to prove the charge.

Lord Carnarvon, ex-Viceroy of Ireland, left Dublin on Thursday. He was followed to the railway station by enormous crowds and was enthusiastically cheered.

Miss Mary Gladstone, daughter of Mr. Gladstone, was married on Tuesday morning to the Rev. Harry Drew, of Hawarden. The ceremony was performed in St. Margaret's Church, Westminster. The Prince and Princess of Wales were present.

Prince Bismarck on Thursday, in the debate in the Prussian Landtag on the expulsion of the Poles from Germany, made a remarkable speech, occupying two hours in its delivery. He said the primary cause of the Government's action was the disloyalty of the Poles to the German Crown. They were constantly engaged in intrigues against the Government, and had made themselves a steady annoyance to Prussia. By acting as accomplices of the Opposition in the German Parliament, they effected a majority against the Government, and the Crown could do nothing less than either deny the demands of such a majority, or else destroy the evil element which made the majority possible. The Polish agitation in Germany, Prince Bismarck said, had always appeared to him an element of danger, and had compelled him to keep a watch upon Russia. The Poles had been constantly, and not always unsuccessfully, endeavoring to set foreign States against Prussia. "Hence," continued the Chancellor, "we have determined to buy out all the real estate owned by Polish nobles in Prussian Poland, and place German colonists on the lands hitherto occupied by the expelled people. In order to make the colonization inure permanently to the benefit of the empire, the colonists will be prohibited from marrying Poles. The cost of the undertaking will be about 300,000,000 marks (about $75,000,000), but the State will lose no more than 10 per cent. of this—a loss made necessary by the exigencies of the case, buying out an alien class and reselling to Germans—while the gain to the empire will be immeasurable. The Government will never concede the restoration of Poland, nor a hair's breadth in that direction. Religion is in nowise connected with the expulsions."

The discussion of the Polish expulsions was continued in the Lower House of the Prussian Landtag on Friday evening. The Polish members denied that the Poles were trying to eliminate the German element from eastern Prussia, although they confessed that a hope was entertained of the restoration of the Polish kingdom. Herr von Puttkamer, the Minister of the Interior, replied that any efforts to obtain the re-establishment of the Polish kingdom would constitute an act of high treason.

The Polish policy of Prince Bismarck has produced a general excitement throughout Germany and Austria. The immense Lubrienski estate, containing about 200,000 acres, one of the largest estates in Prussia, is offered for sale next April, as a result of the expulsions of the Poles. The inhabitants of the estate have for years been mainly Poles, and the edict of expulsion, by forcibly removing the tenantry and depriving the estate of its revenue, has thrown it upon the market. Addresses of sympathy have been sent to Bismarck by Germans in every part of the empire, and many have already reached him from people in Austria, especially from Bohemia.

In the latest collective note the Powers agree to prevent any warlike steps in the Balkans or territorial modifications.

It was reported on Wednesday that the warlike views of the Greek Cabinet had suddenly changed, and that they had issued a declaration that "Greece would comply with the wishes of Europe."

It was reported on Saturday from Athens that the King of Greece had become tired of the politics of the Athenians and especially their present warlike attitude, and would probably soon abdicate and retire to Copenhagen.

Turkey and Bulgaria have reached an understanding by which Prince Alexander will receive the title of Mushir and Governor-General of Eastern Rumelia. In case they are needed, Bulgaria will contribute 80,000 troops to the Turkish army.

The text of the treaty between France and Madagascar has been submitted to the French Chamber of Deputies. French property in Madagascar is to be inviolable without the sanction of the French Consul. Complete amnesty is to be granted to the prisoners taken on both sides during the recent war.

The French Cabinet has approved M. de Freycinet's scheme for a protectorate over Tonquin and Anam. A council of protection will be established at Hué. M. Paul Bert will be Resident-General, and there will be two Assistant Residents, one at Hué and the other at Hanoi. The protectorate will be a special independent department, having its own laws, budget, and general autonomy. Subsidies will be granted it as long as needed.

The French Government has appointed a permanent commission to examine into questions in relation to the monetary standard at home and abroad.

M. Armand Baschet, the French author, is dead at the age of fifty-seven. His reputation rests principally on many interesting publications resulting from his researches among the archives of Venice.

The St. Petersburg police authorities, having ascertained that a Nihilist plot was being formed, arrested twenty-three persons on Friday. On the discovery of the conspiracy the police, fearing that injury to the Czar was intended, advised him to return to his palace at Gatchina. He, however, declined to do so.

The Spanish budget shows a deficit of about $4,000,000. The Minister of Finance proposes certain reforms to restore the equilibrium.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PRESIDENT'S POSITION.

SOME day, and probably before many years, people will look back at the controversy now pending between the President and the Senate with wonder. The President is the Chief Magistrate of a nation of 60,000,000, and probably enjoys more real power than any constitutional monarch in the world. The Senate is universally admitted to be now the most powerful upper house in existence. The interests over which both President and Senate watch are vast almost beyond comparison, and the future for which they have in some degree to provide is so great that it overpowers the national imagination. The turning of the Republican party out of office, too, after having carried the nation through a great revolutionary crisis, was an almost unprecedented feat of peaceful politics. We do not believe any party so thoroughly entrenched in power was ever before dislodged by a popular vote with so little disturbance either to the orderly march of the Government or to the commercial interests of the country.

When one thinks upon these things, however, and then turns to the business which has been engaging a large part of the attention of both the Senate and the Executive during the past year, and especially during the past three months, one is filled with amazement. The President has had to fill 1,282 offices in his immediate gift since he came into power. Of these vacancies only 645 were due to removals. The rest were caused by resignation and death and the expiration of terms. It is melancholy that he should have had so many appointments to make. His time was meant for, and ought, to be devoted to better things. But considering the condition in which he found the civil service of the Government—that is, officered entirely by political partisans for political reasons, and officered, too, almost entirely with creatures or nominees of the Senators of one party—his moderation in making changes is wonderful. We doubt whether any ruler called on to deal with a great evil, and acting under powerful pressure from his own followers, ever applied the knife with so sparing a hand. While we yield to no one in the earnestness of our advocacy of tenure during good behavior, and the complete divorce of the subordinate branches of the public service from politics, we confess our astonishment that a man has been found, who, bred in the ordinary traditions of the Democratic party since Jackson's day, has had the courage and self-restraint to proceed as slowly as President Cleveland has done in the abatement of a monster evil, and make as manful a resistance as he has made to demands for party revenge which it requires almost superhuman virtue not to call legitimate.

That he has made many mistakes we admit and have often admitted, but this is simply confessing that the Democratic party did not nominate an angel unawares. But he has, all things considered—the composition and history of his own party, the condition of the civil service, the state of public opinion, and the demands of his place on his time and strength—made so few mistakes, has displayed so few weaknesses, and given so many evidences of preferring the public interests to those of party, that one cannot help regarding his appearance at this crisis in our history as something providential. If he were more of a reformer than he has proved himself to be, he would probably have made reform odious; if he were less, he would probably, like his predecessor, Mr. Hayes, have made it contemptible.

All that he claims for himself now, in this controversy with the Senate, is that, in considering the comparatively few changes he has made, the presumption shall be in his favor—that is, that it shall be taken for granted, until the contrary is proved, that in making any particular removal he has acted from good motives, and with an eye to the public good. To this presumption, it seems to us, he has shown himself fully entitled. Both what he has done and what he has refrained from doing give him a fair claim to have a favorable construction put on his acts. This is what he now asks of the Senate. That is, he expects as a matter of courtesy and justice that he shall not, at the demand of each of the very few petty officials whom he has removed, be called upon to show publicly that his action was not due to base or unworthy motives. We do not say, we repeat, that he has proved a perfect President. But we do say that he has, in all that relates to his management of the patronage, shown himself so much superior to any of his predecessors within the last fifty years that he at least ought not to be exposed to any indignity or impertinence from which his predecessors were exempt. To call him to the bar of the Senate and ask him to tell why he turned Smith out of this post-office and Brown out of that gaugership, is an indignity and an impertinence. Moreover, the Senate should be the last body in the community to offer it, for probably 90 per cent. of all the removals and appointments which have during the last twenty-five years, brought loss or discredit on the Government, or helped to corrupt and debase the politics of the country, have had their origin in the Senate Chamber. It is certainly not the Senate which can furnish judges to sit on President Cleveland's Administration in aught that relates to the purity of the public service.

Whether the President should himself be freer in letting the public know the reasons which have actuated him in making removals is another matter. We think it wise for him to take the people into his confidence with regard to such changes to any extent which his time and strength will permit. We believe nothing but good to him and the things he has most at heart could come from his letting all the world know both why he has removed so many, and yet so few. For nothing to us seems clearer than that in any attempt to put the Government on a business footing he will have to rely for success on the support he gets from public opinion. From men in public life he will in nine cases out of ten meet with either secret or open obstruction. The plain people who live by honest industry will be his best friends in trying to administer public affairs honestly, as they were the best friends of Lincoln in prosecuting the war for the Union. President Cleveland, unless we are greatly mistaken, is, in fact, doing what President Lincoln would have tried to do had he lived, and doing it in much the same way in which President Lincoln would have done it—slowly, cautiously, and with constant remembrance of the fact that there is a great deal of human nature in man.

THE COPYRIGHT QUESTION AGAIN.

THE copyright question is again before Congress, and various authors and literary men have received a hearing from the Committee of the Senate, on a bill which has been introduced by General Hawley at the instance of the American Copyright League. Another bill has, however, been introduced by Senator Chace, which is supported in a pamphlet by Mr. Henry C. Lea, the well-known author and publisher of Philadelphia. Senator Hawley's bill simply offers reciprocity to the foreign author, so that he could come here and secure copyright for his books, on complying with the requisite legal formalities, if his own country did the same thing for the American author. It is, in fact, an author's bill pure and simple.

Mr. Lea objects to this on behalf of the American reader, inasmuch as it would probably in its practical operation make books dearer; next on behalf of the paper-makers, printers, and binders, who would lose the work they now get in reprinting foreign or rather English books, inasmuch as the English author on obtaining copyright here would almost invariably have his book produced at home. On this point Mr. Lea makes the usual protectionist argument on behalf of native industry. Senator Chace's bill, on the other hand, provides for the manufacture in this country of all foreign books obtaining an American copyright, and absolutely prohibits the importation of foreign editions of the works so copyrighted. This prohibition, Mr. Lea says, is essential, and that it is "an invariable rule in all countries where copyright exists," but he fails to mention that it is a rule for the benefit of the author, not of the manufacturer. An English author can grant a permit to import foreign editions of his books, if he owns the copyright at home. Under Mr. Chace's bill no author could do anything of the kind.

Now, we understand the position of the protectionist opponents of the Hawley bill, or any author's bill, perfectly. We see why they desire to save the home paper-maker, printer, and bookbinder from foreign competition. What we do not understand is the exceptional way in which they seek to secure this protection. Against all other products of foreign industry all they ask by way of protection is either high import duties or total prohibition. But as regards foreign books, they claim the right of seizing the commodity and selling it for their own benefit. That is, they allow of its introduction and then convert it to their own use, unless the foreign producer chooses to accept their terms. When pushed to the wall for a moral defence of this system, they fall back on what we have always considered a most dreary bit of metaphysical slipslop. The air of profundity with which the ordinary champion of protectionist copyright produces it has always seemed to us very comic. We are far from putting Mr. Lea in this category, however, and yet we could hardly read in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his pamphlet without a smile that old story that "society recognizes no absolute and unlimited ownership in any species of property. All that the individual earns or inherits is held under such limitations as society sees fit to impose, in return for the protection which is afforded by the social compact, and the value which is imparted to ownership by the aggregation of individuals in communities."

This is all true as Gospel, but it is no more true of literary property than of property in houses and lands and railroad shares. Property in these things is also limited by the "social compact" and divers other more tangible agencies. But one of the great differences between civilized and uncivilized communities, between Dahomey and the United States for instance, is that in the latter the limitation on property is not enforced by "Society," except for the benefit of the whole community and on making due compensation to the owner. Society among civilized men in practice does not take any man's property away from him, or allow it to be taken, except for public use, and after giving the owner its value out of the Treasury. The one solitary exception to this rule is made in the case of literary property, and it is now only made by the United States. It is only here that civilized men get up and defend, on "high priori" grounds, the practice of taking away from a man, as not property, a thing which they themselves sell on the market as property.

The truth is, that whatever any man can sell and make a profit on is, or ought to be, in the eye of the law property. The dress, called a book, in which a man clothes his ideas is property, because, like cows or horses, it can be traced, identified, and sold on the market, and is therefore entitled to such protection as its peculiar nature calls for, like all other possessions. The ownership in land is not proved or protected in the same way as the ownership in railroad stocks; nor the ownership in railroad stocks in the same way as that in a bill of exchange. The difficulty of protecting property in books is greater than the difficulty in protecting any other property, because the thief can multiply the stolen article indefinitely; but the law is not called on to make all kinds of possessions equally secure. The law is called on to provide, for everything a man produces, and which anybody else would buy if he could not steal it, that simple, primary form of protection which consists in the prevention of open robbery or a robbery pure and simple in broad daylight. To this foreign authors are entitled from us, whatever may be our views about the tariff, or the need of protecting our native printers and bookbinders. We may protect these as we protect other producers, by any duty, however high, but we have no right to say to the foreign author that he must pay his duty or have the fruits of his industry appropriated by the first comer without any compensation whatever. It is the offer of this alternative, and this only, which brings discredit on the American name in this copyright matter, and it is made worse by being defended on metaphysical grounds. The a priori argument in its favor irresistibly reminds one of the way Dr. Johnson disposed of Boswell's attempts to prove that a certain lady was, in spite of appearances, a virtuous woman. It was short and incisive, but will not bear repetition.

NEW YORK IN THE SENATE.

New York, although the greatest commercial State in the Union, has now for many years been represented in the Senate by gentlemen who, to all outward appearance, took no interest in economical or financial questions. Its foremost Senator from 1867 to 1881 was Mr. Roscoe Conkling, who, we believe, contributed nothing that any one can remember to the debates which preceded the remonetization of silver and the resumption of specie payments, important as these were. New York owes her rapid growth and present supremacy almost entirely to foreign trade. It is her port which has made her what she is, yet in all the debates on the tariff and on custom-house management Mr. Conkling generally advocated whatever was likely to make the port of New York less attractive to foreigners, and to diminish the volume of trade passing through it. Mr. Edwin D. Morgan has in fact, extraordinary as it may seem, been the only person connected even remotely with foreign trade who has appeared for New York in the Senate since the close of the Rebellion. Ira Harris was a lawyer from the interior, Reuben E. Fenton was engaged in what are called "mercantile pursuits," but they were strictly domestic. Francis Kernan was a lawyer also. What Thomas C. Platt was or is, we think it would puzzle his warmest admirers to say. Warner Miller, as everybody now knows, is a paper manufacturer, and very hostile to "abroad," and Elbridge G. Lapham was a lawyer. Not one of these gentlemen, except Mr. Morgan, in any way represented or spoke for, or we might almost add understood, the basis on which the greatness of this city rests.

A great many people supposed, when Mr. Evarts went to the Senate, that this bad tradition would be broken. He speaks with fluency on so many subjects, that they supposed he would of course speak on the things which must make for the prosperity of this city and State, and foremost among these is a fixed and steady standard of value. All the great commercial cities of the world, Venice, Amsterdam, and London, have found this absolutely necessary to the maintenance of their commercial supremacy. Both Venice and Amsterdam during their prime found that the best help to their commerce was the maintenance through their respective banks of an unchangeable standard of value. For two hundred years the "bank money" of Amsterdam occupied in Europe the proud position which the "pound sterling" of London has occupied for the last century, as something in which any man might make promises without fearing that he would have to pay more than he agreed, or might accept promises without fearing that he would have to receive less than he expected. The American dollar, as the money of the great emporium of the western world, ought as a measure of value to have a place just as high as the pound sterling. Men in the remotest ends of the earth ought to know just what it is worth to-day, and just what it will be worth ten years hence.

When Mr. Evarts entered the Senate, a good many people expected that he would battle for this great consummation; that he would stand up for the only true "poor man's money"—that is, money on the ups and downs of which rich men cannot speculate. But these simple-minded persons have thus far been sadly disappointed. Not one word about currency or standards has been got out of him in the Senate. As far as the currency question is concerned, he might as well be on a journey or asleep, like the god Baal, who treated his worshippers so badly. They called, as Mr. Evarts's admirers are now doing, "on the name of Baal from morning until noon, saying, Oh, Baal, hear us! but there was no voice nor any that answered."

All that we have heard from Mr. Evarts as yet about the silver question consists in a somewhat mysterious appeal to the American people, uttered in Boston, to exert "pressure" about silver, more on one side than on the other; but as to the side of himself on which he would like the greatest pressure he has failed to give the slightest hint. That he has opinions about silver his friends, however, still stoutly maintain, in spite of his address before the Monetary Conference, which greatly puzzled the foreign members, for they expected to be addressed in terms of money, and were surprised to hear the American delegate discuss the question in terms of transcendental philosophy. He cannot, however, much longer remain silent. He cannot, without being unfaithful to his great trust, refuse to say on which side he would like "pressure." He must know that at such a crisis the State in which a large part of the national revenue is collected must have something to say about the standard of value. He must know, also, that if it had been supposed that his mind was a blank on the subject of currency, or that his researches had carried him no further than the conclusion that there ought to be a currency of some kind, but that, as the Irishman said, "the divil only knew" what kind of currency it ought to be, he never could have been elected. In fact, everybody who examines or observes him feels now every day more confident that a speech on silver is coming, and that it will be clear and concise, and that he will take his stand on the great principle known to the logicians as the Excluded Middle.

ENGLAND: ON THE EVE OF THE SESSION.

London, January 19, 1886.

Never since the meeting of the first reformed Parliament, more than half a century ago, has the opening of a Parliamentary session been watched with so much curiosity and anxiety as now fills the minds of the British people. It is not the mere eagerness of London quidnuncs or professional politicians to know into whose hands power and patronage will fall; it is more than the earnestness of the advocates of some scheme of reform to discover what the mind of Parliament will prove to be towards their projects. It is the perplexity of people who find themselves in a position wholly unprecedented, with questions calling for solution which touch the whole system of English government, and before which the most practised statesmanship halts and hesi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tates. The circumstances are as peculiar as their course is menacing. The House of Commons is divided into three parties, each bitterly hostile to the other two. One of them is all but equal in strength to the other two. None is strong enough to assume and carry on the government of the country unless it receives a large and steady support from one of the others, or from some considerable section thereof; and no such support can be looked for except upon terms which would oblige the party receiving it to forego much of its own policy. As the Liberal party is very much stronger than the Tory (by about eighty members), the natural thing would seem to be for the Tory party, *now in power, to resign or be turned out*, and for its more moderate men to help the Liberals face the crisis. This comes nearer to the usage of government by a majority than a continued tenure of power by a Ministry which is in a minority of 160 or more of the whole House. But the Liberal party is itself so divided that it might prove unable to hold together, and keep its leaders in power as a Ministry. In previous letters I have called your attention to the serious differences of view that separate the moderate or Whiggish from the advanced or Radical section of the Liberals. These differences of opinion, expressed and aggravated in and by personal antagonisms between some of the leading men, would make the formation of a strong Liberal Cabinet no easy matter, even apart from the Irish question. But the Irish question seems to be producing a still deeper rift. The disposition to favor some scheme of home rule for Ireland (*i. e.*, a separate Parliament for that island, with control of Irish affairs), which has been attributed to Mr. Gladstone since the middle of last December, has, as your readers know, produced a copious and vehement discussion of the Irish problem. So far this discussion has been almost wholly on one side. The opponents of home rule have argued and declaimed with great force and fertility of illustration. Its advocates have scarcely replied, so that one cannot well tell what numbers or influence to assign to them. But, so far as can be judged, they are in a minority, perhaps a small minority, even in the ranks of the Liberal party itself. Nearly all the territorial magnates who head the Whig section of the party, including such men as the Dukes of Argyll, Bedford, and Westminster, are strongly opposed to the plan attributed to Mr. Gladstone. All the moderate men, and that solid centre of the party which includes the wealth and respectability of the upper middle class (*so far as it belongs to the Liberal party*), are equally averse. Many of the Radical chiefs, including, it is believed, Mr. Chamberlain himself, who used to be represented as too indulgent to Irish schemes, regard with distrust equal to that of the Dukes the idea of giving to such men as the Nationalist members the unchecked control of Irish destinies through an Irish Parliament.

It is not hard to explain this sentiment and see why it should unite men so far asunder as the Duke of Argyll and Mr. Chamberlain. The Nationalist party has done its utmost at Westminster to paralyze, to discredit, to insult the House of Commons of the United Kingdom. Some of its members have been reasonably suspected of connivance with agrarian as well as political crime. They have shown little aptitude for constructive legislation, little disposition to respect the security of property and person in Ireland. The Nationalist newspapers have been furious and brutal to a degree which even our respect for the liberty of the press finds it hard to tolerate. Every calumny is heaped upon English statesmen, every means taken of kindling Irish hatred against the whole people of Great Britain. At the last general election, the Irish vote was everywhere cast solid, under Mr. Parnell's orders, against Liberal candidates, even where the individual candidate had shown sympathy with Irish claims; and it is owing to this policy of the Nationalist chiefs that Mr. Gladstone does not now command a majority of the House of Commons. While the campaign was at its height, he appealed in passionate terms to the electors to place the Liberals in a majority sufficient to enable them to resist Mr. Parnell and to save the House of Commons from being left at the mercy of a faction which desired to injure it for their own purposes. No wonder, then, that the bulk of the English Liberals, who have for the last six years looked on the Parnellites as *their bitterest foes, are bewildered when they are* told that the main claim of the Parnellites is substantially a just claim, and may have to be conceded. This seems to them a sudden change of front, which they are not prepared to execute without much more thought than they have yet bestowed on the grave issues involved.

Among those Liberals who are disposed to give home rule a fair or even favorable consideration, two types of view may be distinguished. There are some who, wearied and disgusted by the long series of failures on the part of England to pacify Ireland, to establish good government and evoke good feeling, think that the time has come for a new departure. They admit that home rule is a dangerous experiment, but they add that, however bad, it can hardly be worse than a continuance of the policy of the past eighty years. When the old remedies have failed with a lamentably unbroken uniformity, the time has come for a new prescription. There are others who scarcely venture to argue the matter, but are moved by the instinct of loyalty to Mr. Gladstone and confidence in his superior insight. If he, they say, after all his experience of Irish troubles, has come to the conclusion that an Irish Parliament gives some sort of chance of making things better, there must be grounds for his hopes, and we are willing to follow and support him. The number of these men would probably be larger but for the alarm produced among them by the explosion of hostility to Mr. Gladstone and his supposed scheme from the other section of the Liberal party. People will tell you under their breath that they would be willing to give home rule a fair hearing and probably a trial, only the country is so evidently opposed to it that there is really no use at present in treating it as a possible course. Perhaps we may have to come to it after all, but *not now. Such reticence makes it hard to say* what support Mr. Gladstone would get were he to announce a policy such as that which has been ascribed to him; but so far as can be conjectured at present, that support would not much exceed, if it reached, one-half of the Liberal members of the House of Commons. Under these circumstances, with so serious a question standing in the near foreground, the prospects of Liberal union are not bright. Should Mr. Gladstone waive the home-rule question for the present, he may keep his party together. Should he declare himself in favor of an Irish Legislature, it seems impossible for him to do so. It is useless to speculate as to his intentions, because they may probably have been declared before this letter reaches you.

The attitude of the Tory party can be more easily and briefly described. Traditionally they are opposed to all concessions to Ireland, and, having resisted the Church Bill of 1869 and the Land bills of 1870 and 1881, they are *a fortiori* inclined to resist the grant of a separate legislature. They are moved not only by general Conservative sentiment, but also by alarm for the security of property and horror at the precedent that would be set by the dispossession of Irish landlords, which an Irish Parliament would soon effect were the reins thrown on its neck. The English landed aristocracy is, moreover, attached by family ties as well as by class sympathy to the Irish landlords, and all the Loyalist members who come from Ireland belong to the Tory party, and would revolt against it were it to yield to Mr. Parnell. Notwithstanding all this, it is credibly reported that the present Tory Government was at one time disposed to entertain a plan for the creation of what would have been in reality, whether or no in name also, a separate Parliament for Ireland. The dropping of the Crimes Act last summer, the sending over as Viceroy of Lord Carnarvon, who has just *retired from that office; the intimate relations* which subsisted (according to common belief) between a prominent Tory minister and the Nationalist leaders, all confirm this suspicion (some minor grounds for which I forbear to give). There would have been nothing wrong in their taking such a course, for they might have said that experience had shown the failure of previous attempts to govern Ireland from Westminster and through a centralized bureaucracy in Dublin, and that it was better to admit that they, as well as other English statesmen, had previously erred than to persist in a policy condemned by experience. Lord Salisbury's references to the home-rule question during the election campaign were so carefully worded as to leave it quite open to him to propose a scheme of home rule, and he scrupulously avoided anything that could give offence to the Nationalists so long as it seemed possible that by the aid of the Irish vote in England he could obtain a majority in the House of Commons. However, he did not obtain that majority, and very shortly afterward came the statements of Mr. Gladstone's alleged intentions. The storm of opposition which these statements evoked dispelled such doubts as may have lingered in the mind of the Tory Cabinet regarding the line they ought to take. They were not strong enough to carry a home-rule measure, even with the help of the Parnellites, if the Liberal party opposed it, especially as their contingent of Irish Tories, seventeen strong, would have revolted. They saw, moreover, that the general sentiment of the upper and middle class in England disliked the notion of home rule. This sentiment was as strong and more general in the Tory party than in the Liberal. Hence, it was clearly the wisest course to drop all ideas of home rule and Parnellite help, to put the ship promptly about, and fall *off on the other tack, trusting that the breath* of popular dislike to anything like surrender to the Irish would fill their sails. I do not say that this was the way they reasoned, for the Tory Cabinet as a whole may never have contemplated the policy which some of its members were meditating. But, anyhow, such reasonings were natural, and seem to offer the best prospect of party success.

Every one now expects the Cabinet to deliver itself in an energetic and patriotic sense in favor of the complete maintenance of legislative union with Ireland. Whether they will also propose a new coercion bill is more doubtful. The *Times* and the bulk of their own party in the country urge them to do so, while many Liberals would support them in Parliament in carrying such a measure. But it is understood that what they would like best is to escape that and every other responsibility by retiring from office. The position is so difficult and dangerous that they discover no hope of facing it through a whole session, except in the unlikely event of a section of the Liberal party coming over to them. It is probable enough that Liberal votes might float their ship over a coercion bill. But with a majority of 160 opposed to them on general questions, what prospects have they of carrying their Budget two months

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hence, and weathering the other storms which the session is sure to have in store? If they must go, better go at once than after they have committed and entangled themselves by producing a programme. However, they cannot well resign without an adverse vote of the House of Commons, and it is supposed that they will go as far as usage permits in courting such a vote, and shifting the burden of the present position on to the Liberals. As this might open a schism in the ranks of the latter, these desire to prevent it, and if possible to keep the Tories in power for some while longer. It is like a duel in which both combatants seek to avoid delivering the first blow, or a game of chess where the side that moves first expects to lose the game. Much skill is needed. Mr. Gladstone is the most skilful player, but he has also the most difficult game, and his advanced age makes it harder for him to play that waiting game which may turn out to be the safest. Y.

THE PERMANENT DIFFICULTIES OF ENGLISH FOREIGN POLICY.

OXFORD, January 3, 1886.

JINGOISM has failed; anti-Jingoism has failed. Lord Beaconsfield's love of adventure, Mr. Gladstone's fear of responsibility, have ended in failure. No honest Conservative can pretend that Lord Beaconsfield solved the Egyptian problem; no honest Liberal can now deny that the Egyptian policy of Mr. Gladstone has been from beginning to end a series of blunders. What makes the failure of English statesmanship in the management of foreign affairs the more noteworthy is that both Lord Beaconsfield and Mr. Gladstone brought to the service of their country very extraordinary talents and enjoyed very remarkable opportunities for success. During the Conservative rule England might assuredly, had she chosen, have annexed Egypt. When Mr. Gladstone had bombarded Alexandria, the success of our fleet, combined with the voluntary withdrawal of France, left the game in our own hands. Neither want of talent nor want of opportunity prevented the Tory or the Liberal Prime Minister from achieving a triumph. The failure of England has flowed from general causes, and it is well worth while to examine into the nature of the difficulties which at the present moment hamper the foreign policy of the country. These sources of failure are various.

England, in the first place, is not, relatively to other countries, the Power which she was seventy years ago. England, it is true, possesses a reserve of strength which it is easy for pessimists to underestimate. The Great Britain of 1886 is a more contented, a more flourishing, a more united country than was the Great Britain of 1815. In Wraxall's 'Memoirs'—that curious repertory of inaccurate gossip which nevertheless contains a striking picture of the times—it is said that one reason against retaining Napoleon as a prisoner in England was the dread lest he should place himself at the head of the discontented classes. The fact that any man of judgment should have thought it possible for a French exile to revolutionize England, is as singular a proof as can be found of the feeling which, during the Regency, pervaded even the Tory party, that the people were not loyal to the national institutions. No Tory of 1884 would dread the presence in England of a modern Napoleon. But strength in matters of policy is a comparative term, and if the England of to-day is absolutely a more powerful country than the England of our grandfathers, it is equally certain that the England of 1884 is, in comparison with the leading states of Europe, a weaker nation than the England of 1814. To say this is nothing more than to assert what nobody in his senses would deny, namely, that the nations of the Continent have made immense progress during the last seventy years. United Germany, United Italy, Republican France, have each in their way established that supremacy of fixed law which was at one time the peculiar characteristic of English society, and which was to England a source of marvellous and almost unlimited strength. We must, too, remember that foreign states which until lately were solely occupied in the rivalries and the intrigues of the Continent, have now followed the example of England, and have begun to covet and acquire colonial empire.

The foreign policy of England, in the next place, betrays a greatly increased tendency to vary with fluctuations of public opinion. This influence of opinion is in itself no new phenomenon. The Peace of Utrecht and the Peace of Versailles are each monuments of a reversal in national policy as sudden as the change from the imperialism of Lord Beaconsfield to the humanitarianism of Mr. Gladstone. But a phenomenon which is not new in kind may become so much more developed in degree as to have the importance of a new fact; and few observers would dispute that the violence and the rapidity of the fluctuations in English public opinion have greatly increased. Nor is it certain that this is a transitory feature of modern England. Every change which for seventy years past has taken place in our institutions and habits has added weight to that most uncertain of all influences which is called public opinion. Nor is the changeableness of public sentiment the only, or perhaps the most, serious feature of the case. A matter of at least equal importance is that free discussion produces something like an equal balance of opposed convictions. Politicians talk boldly of the people wishing or demanding this and that, whereas in fact the millions who are supposed to have one distinct will, consist of a mass of individuals entertaining different and often opposed principles or prejudices. But when public opinion means nothing but a balance of opposite wishes, the result comes near to the non-existence of any real public opinion whatever.

The opinion, again, of the English electors is not only fluctuating, as popular sentiment always is, but also (what it very often is not) unknown, and for the moment, as regards foreign affairs, unknowable. The constituencies have till recently left diplomacy wholly in the hands of statesmen. In this they have shown English good sense. Mr. Gladstone's appeal in 1880 to the public on Eastern policy broke in disastrously upon the tradition of English politics, and it is quite uncertain whether a habit of self-restraint, once broken down, can or cannot be restored. Add to this that the newly enfranchised electors are, on all subjects affecting foreign lands, profoundly ignorant. Of the rustics who three or four weeks ago gave the Liberals a majority, and whose vote therefore went a good way toward determining the relation of this country to Egypt, probably not more than one in a hundred knew more of the valley of the Nile than can be gathered from the Book of Genesis. Dean Stanley used to say that the general interest exhibited by the crowd in the Shah arose from the knowledge of Persia gained from the Bible, and it is not rash to suppose that to many intelligent electors Egypt may still be the land of the Pharaohs. Popular stupidity need not of itself be inconsistent with popular resolution or obstinacy, and it is possible that the influence of a great statesman, or some dim perception of the importance to England of maintaining her influence at Cairo, or even the instinctive tenacity with which the nation has for centuries held fast to imperial power, may at last lead the English democracy to approve a policy in the East as consistent and as thorough-going as the policy ultimately sanctioned by the democracy of the Northern States during the war of secession; but at the present time, on all great political issues, and especially issues on questions of foreign diplomacy, the leaders of public opinion are uncertain in what direction and to what extent they would be followed by the people whom they profess to guide. English statesmen are as uncertain whether the democracy does or does not value imperial greatness, as up to 1860 were the politicians of America whether the Northern democracy was prepared to resist the break-up of the Union. The embarrassment caused by this state of things, though a real and a great impediment to consistent action, will pass away. The statesmen of England will, after no long time, understand the will and the wishes of the electors of England.

The real secret, however, of the paralysis which affects the action of England in regard to foreign states lies (I am convinced) a good deal deeper than any of the external difficulties already enumerated, though these difficulties are in their own way real enough. The source of national weakness and hesitation may be best found, not by examining the public acts of the Government, but by reflecting upon the sentiments which, as each man really knows or surmises, affect his own political conduct and the conduct of his friends. Self-knowledge is as indispensable in politics as it is in morals or religion. The examination into what, if I remember rightly, metaphysicians call the contents of consciousness, shows that the mind of each individual and therefore the general mind of the nation is divided between different, though not (perhaps) radically inconsistent, principles, and is attracted by diverse if not inconsistent ideals. We all know that government depends at bottom upon force. We all, on the other hand, feel with Mr. Bright that for many evils force is no remedy. We most of us perceive that liberty itself depends upon obedience to law, but we also feel, in a way in which no other generation has felt, that there are crises at which the individual conscience asserts the right to obey a "higher law" which may easily conflict with the provisions of acts of Parliament. There is not the remotest reason to suppose that the courage of Englishmen has declined. We are as bold as our forefathers: we know the extent of a risk; we, like them, are prepared to run it; but we venture less because we know more. George III. and his ministers would not have gone with a light heart into the contest with the American colonies could they have foreseen all that the conflict involved. Ignorance with them was not only bliss but courage. When a modern statesman is called upon to determine how he shall deal, say with Egypt or with some demand made by France or Germany, he, unfortunately for his calmness of mind, sees a little though not much beyond the matters actually before him; and what is true of statesmen is true also in a measure even of the humblest of their followers. Hence hesitation in beginning schemes of action and fluctuation in carrying them out. Hence, to give one example of my meaning, the bombardment of Alexandria to put down a rebellion against the Khedive, and the refusal to allow the nominal ruler of Egypt to execute conquered rebels for rebellion. Here, again, time will by degrees, it may be hoped, bring a remedy. Increase of knowledge will bring the next generation out of the twilight caused by that half-knowledge which is only another form of ignorance. On one or two leading points of policy men's minds will at last become settled. We shall have again that most useful though much abused guide, a diplomatic tradition; and it will be a tradition founded on facts, and not, like many forms of traditional policy, on fictions, or rather on reminiscences of facts which were once important, but which have ceased to be of moment.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This unstableness of conviction no doubt affects every part of public life. It is, however, more visibly operative than elsewhere in the department of foreign policy. The first need for Englishmen is to recognize in this uncertainty of aim a true reason for modesty, for caution, for reserve in action. We must follow Sydney Smith's advice to individuals, and as a nation take "short views" of life. The next need for the country is that educated Englishmen, who will for long be the guides of the uneducated masses, should make up their own minds on the answer to be given to the leading questions of policy. To know one's own mind is the basis of sound resolutions. When these are arrived at, England will show little hesitation in carrying them into effect. A. V. DICEY.

Correspondence.

THE IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Events at Washington seem to arrange themselves, like the experiments of a lecturer on physics, for the illustration of a great principle. The Senate is aching—Democrats as well as Republicans—to get the upper hand of the President, *but it is a game which requires great caution* in the playing. The next move turns upon the furnishing of information ostensibly for the guidance of the Senate in the matter of confirming appointments or rather removals. There are several courses open to the President and his advisers. They may send in the information to the secret session of the Senate, which is very much as if the garrison of a town were to send out all the weapons and munitions from their arsenal for the besiegers to help themselves, while the besieged were under bonds to remain shut up in the casemates. Information given in open session would be in practice just as bad, as the Republicans would, of course, color it to suit their own purposes, and we have already seen what support the President can expect from his nominal party allies, who are Senators much more than Democrats. If the President refuses the information altogether, he will put himself in the wrong, because concealment always excites snspicion—a tendency which his amiable opponents will not be slow to nourish.

The next step on the part of the Senate seems likely to be the summoning of the Secretaries before the executive session, or more probably, as it would carry a more distinct assertion of superiority, before the Judiciary Committee. I read in the despatches from Washington that "already Senators are wishing they could be in the sombre precincts of the Judiciary Committee room when Chairman Edmunds proceeds to interrogate Cabinet Minister Garland for contempt." Is there not something exceedingly pleasant in the idea of a Senator from the little State of Vermont putting the confidential adviser of the President, the representative of ten millions of voters, to torture in an inquisitorial dungeon for "contempt"? If the President values his independence, he will politely but distinctly refuse to allow his Cabinet officers to appear before any secret body whatever.

There remains one course open, and it is the only one which is at once manly and consistent with the dignity and independence of the Executive. He can say to the Senate: "You can have all the information you want, provided that my representatives, in furnishing it, are placed upon an equal footing before the country with members of the Legislature. If you desire the attendance of the members of the Cabinet in open session of the Senate, they are ready to appear, and to answer, upon due notice given, any questions which you think fit to put."

There would be very little risk in such a course, as Senators with the eye of the country upon them would be extremely cautious in making their attack. They live quite too much in glass houses to be very reckless about throwing stones. Indeed, the proposition would no doubt be highly distasteful to them, while yet a failure to accept it would completely shut their mouths. Even if some of the President's appointments have been political, it would be a perfectly good defence to show that the precedents of the last twenty years have made complete resistance to political influence upon a change of party almost impossible, while in fact much more has been done in the direction of resistance than of concession.

The effect of such a course upon the future of civil-service reform would be inestimable, as the certainty that the appointing power would be held to personal and public responsibility in the open Senate would be the most powerful of all restraints on the abuse of appointments. The President has before him an opportunity of making his administration an era in history.

G. B.

BOSTON, January 30, 1886.

SILVER PARTISANSHIP IN THE SENATE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the leading editorial in your last issue you state that Senator Morrill's speech on the silver question is the only defence that has been made in the Senate of the President's position on silver coinage. Is not this doing injustice to Senators Gray and McPherson, who have both made sound and able speeches in support of the Administration? They are entitled to all the more credit because they have proved the courage of their convictions in the face of bitter opposition on the part of most of their brethren.

If, as is often supposed, the Republican party is possessed of greater sanity or less insanity in financial matters than their opponents, the supposition has scarcely been verified by the current debate on Senator Beck's resolution. The majority of the present Republican members of the Senate may be satisfied of the unwisdom and danger of the Bland Act; but if so, they are wrongfully suppressing their opinions—probably, as you have recently suggested, by way of scoring a point against the Democrats in the campaign of 1888. It is only a very low standard of political ethics that can sanction such a course on the part of the majority, on the ground that to maintain their real views in vigorous debate might seem to be giving aid and comfort to the Executive, their political enemy.

With a good working majority, it will scarcely be possible for the Republican Senate to avoid sharing responsibility with the Democratic House for any troubles following the action or inaction of the latter on this chief issue of the hour, unless they themselves vote to repeal the Bland Act, and do not replace it with any other mischievous measure. Whether the Republicans can do this is extremely doubtful, unless they receive some conservative Democratic votes. They are only less divided on the question than the Democrats. Among the most intemperate of all the silver advocates are the "Argentine" Republicans from Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska. Even Senator Sherman, the great apostle of resumption, risks his reputation as a financier on a bullion bill almost as objectionable as the latest heresy of Warner; and Senator Morrill alone of all the forty-one Republicans is outspoken in support of the President. There is a small number of Democratic Senators—at least two—who are sound, as the *Nation* and most of its readers count soundness, on both the coinage and tariff questions. Can as much be said of a single Republican in that body? In the House there may be as many Republicans as Democrats who are prepared to repeal the Bland Act on its merits (not to substitute something as bad or worse)—possibly more; but there are not nearly as many of the former, we venture to assert, as of the latter who favor both that repeal and a tariff for revenue only. The balance of wisdom does not incline strongly to either side. Each contains a vast deal of ignorance and demagogy. But as to silver, so long as the President and Secretary Manning hold such an impregnable position as defenders of the nation's credit, we do not think the Republicans are liable to gain much partisan advantage, no matter what the House may do; certainly they cannot unless they make a clear positive record for the right in the body which they control. Honesty is the best policy, and if all members in both branches of Congress would realize it, and act according to their best judgment, the prevalent silver mania might be checked.—Very respectfully, F. C. EATON.

COLUMBUS, O., January 30, 1886.

SOUTHERN OPPOSITION TO THE BLAIR BILL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your editorial of the 21st inst. on "Federal Aid to Education" presents, I think, an objection to the plan so strong and sound as to convince the great majority of reflecting men, whatever their political opinions or preconceived views of the subject. Your proposition that "the vital element of any success that is worth achieving in this world is self-reliance," is beyond successful controversy; and your reference to the development of our infant colonies into American commonwealths is as apposite as it is indisputable.

I have been a school commissioner in the county in which I live for six years, under circumstances which require me to give to the school board the regular public day of the week, notwithstanding it is the busiest day in my profession of law, and I have accepted the place because I feel that I can render no better service to the State to which I owe allegiance than to aid in the maintenance of a system of education, just alike to the taxpayer and the pupil; but I think that there can be seen already in this State a tendency unduly to extend the scope of the public schools and to leave nothing to individual effort.

To those who, like myself, hold that the war between the States has left their rights and obligations unchanged, except as affected by the constitutional amendments, it is impossible consistently to accept the Blair bill. If we fall short of our duty, ours will be the blame, and if we meet it, ours will be the credit. We hold to-day, as we did at the time, that the wholesale enfranchisement of the colored race was not less a political crime than a blunder; and we believe now, as we did then, that it could not have been effected except with a view to the perpetuation of political power by the Republican party. But we know that this error has passed beyond the power of correction, and that we can do nothing better than to deal with the problem of education which confronts us, as generously toward the illiterate as is consistent with just and wise taxation.

I am not unmindful that the South would receive far the larger share of the $100,000,000 proposed to be thus expended, and I remember that the whole sum, even, would not compare with that by which the North has been enriched at the expense of the South, through the operation of the tariff, the fishing bounties, and other measures, and I regret that I cannot give my sup-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

port to the measure; but two wrongs do not make a right in politics, any more than in morals, and retaliation is not good government.

I have no hesitation whatever in opposing in every way in my power the Blair bill or any other measure which teaches our people to shift the burden of any just responsibility upon the Federal Government, and I hope our representatives in Congress will not give this measure their support for the sake of the pecuniary aid it offers, nor without thorough consideration of the matter in all its bearings.

I have read with great interest the adverse views of Judge Tourgée in his 'Appeal to Cæsar,' and I cannot but admire the candor and force of his presentation, but my conviction is unshaken, first, that there is no constitutional warrant for the assumption by the general Government of the education of the people in the States; and second, that even if such warrant should be thought to exist, sound political judgment forbids the exercise of the power. No amount of education and consequent accumulation of wealth can compensate for the decay of manhood which must attend this scheme if adopted, and I trust you will continue to exert the influence of your paper against its adoption.—Yours respectfully,

JAMES A. PEARCE.

CHESTERTOWN, MD., January 25, 1886.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am a Southern man, and very naturally solicitous of the welfare of my section, both morally and physically, and for the latter reason I could not object to the Government sending a few millions down this way for educational or other purposes. But of its being a moral benefit to the negro I have very grave doubts, and that is the class which it principally concerns. My observation of this portion of our citizens has led me and many others to the conclusion that more education or "book-learning" is a positive injury to the welfare of these people. We hope it may bear fruit in the future; it bears no good fruit now. The young colored man or woman (especially the former) fresh from the graduating class is generally a worthless citizen. He thinks labor is not for such as he, and yet what vocation does he fit? Their best friends cannot satisfactorily answer this question. Something should have preceded education or should now do so; but what and how is as difficult of solution as the tariff question. Millions for education will not, in my opinion, improve the moral status of the negro race in the South, and will be of little benefit to them physically.

I think it would be much wiser to give them the "mule and forty acres" long ago promised them by somebody. If Congress would pass a bill giving every negro man in the South fifty acres of land—either that now owned by the Government, or by purchase for them—and make deed in entail, so that they could not sell out to the first cross-roads store, a real and lasting benefit would accrue to them and the whole South; education and better moral training would naturally follow. The negro who owns real property in the South is always a good citizen. Let us, then, make them good citizens first, and education will and must follow. The LeMoyne Institute, a colored school located here, is now having built a large workshop, that the pupils may have the advantage of a mechanical education, practically illustrated by actual labor, and I predict more good from this than from all the other schools combined. J. P. J.

MEMPHIS, TENN., January 24, 1886.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your article of January 21, on Federal Aid to Education, I noticed certain facts which would sustain the position taken against such aid, although no point was made by them. The article shows that nearly as many children in proportion to the population are attending school in the South as in the North. Why, then, has the South more need of school facilities than the North? Is it possible to educate adult ignorance? If a school-house were planted at the door of each negro cabin and every cracker's log hut, no practical man would expect the adult negroes and the adult crackers to enter the school, or, if they did enter, to derive any advantage from it. They must earn their livelihoods in the first place, and their poor ignorance is too set to hope for change. Education offered to any but the ignorance of childhood would be the old offering of pearls to swine. The ignorance of the adult poor of the South is awful, but what power on earth can change it? The only part of the population capable of receiving education is receiving it in as large proportion as in the North. Why, then, does the South need Federal aid to education more than the North? J. H. M.

BOSTON, January 28, 1886.

THE BELL TELEPHONE DECISION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your leader in the *Nation* of the 21st instant, on "The Telephone Case," is admirable and well calculated to do substantial good. The dispassionate statements it contains will commend themselves to every one (not interested in the plaintiffs' attack), who is in any way able to form and hold an opinion. I write to express the earnest hope that you will follow up with your vigorous logic this many-sided subject, in the interest of those who love truth and justice and honest common sense.

The injury which Mr. Lamar's decision has done Mr. Bell and his company, though undoubtedly great, is far exceeded by that inflicted on the whole people and on public morals, and its inevitable effect will be to depreciate property of as legitimate a kind as any in existence. The decision is revolutionary in its nature, and will surely bear the most pernicious fruit, by establishing a precedent for similar attacks whenever the stake is large enough. In an amiable and easy-going way Mr. Lamar, having also some doubts in his own mind which he would like to have settled, proposes to give the anti-Bell corporations, of dubious origin, and their lawyers, a chance, by attacking for them at Government expense a well-sustained patent. I will not venture to recite the *positive* reasons which determined this decision; but there is one *negative* reason of much potency which should not be lost sight of. This is the fact that the four gentlemen who sat as judges at this hearing, and who came, it seems, severally and independently to the same conclusion, knew nothing about patents or patent law, and less about the relations existing between inventive progress and the development and prosperity of the country. And in this opinion, though it may seem somewhat harsh, remembering that the Commissioner of Patents was one of the four, a large number of persons will certainly agree; indeed, it would be difficult to find the man, unbiassed by circumstances, who does not look upon the patent system as suffering serious decadence at this present time. That system, fairly and honestly administered, is thoroughly democratic in the beneficent protection it gives the poor as well as the rich man. It rewards the true and first inventor, whoever and wherever he may be, by giving him a monopoly for a limited number of years in return for something not possessed by the world before. That such a man is the actual inventor, and has given the necessary information in return for a temporary monopoly, is ascertained by the examination, which, under the law should be most thorough.

Herein the American system surpasses all others to a degree which may be crudely estimated by the excess in number of the United States patents over those of other countries, and by the wonderful progress in the arts made here. Every attempt to nullify the broad principle underlying these grants; to confuse and mystify the public as to the nature and equity of the protection afforded; to destroy the efficiency of the examination and so take from the prima-facie value of each patent, or to break them down after issue by Executive interference, is a blow at the rights of property legitimately and, as a rule, very laboriously acquired, and at the manufacturing industries and comforts of the people. When a plausible request by interested persons, addressed to officials as unversed in patent law and practice as in science and technology, is sufficient to bring the great powers of the Government into activity against its own grant, then indeed will patented property of every kind be at the mercy of the speculator and stock-jobber.

Obvious criticism and brilliant suggestions are easily made after the fact; they affect more or less even the strongest minds, while with shallow persons their force is generally overwhelming. Somewhere in his writings Baron Liebig says—not in these words, but to this effect—that every great and far-reaching discovery passes through three well-defined stages or epochs before it is finally accepted by the world. In the first stage the innovation is pronounced—Impossible! In the second it is admitted to be possible but is clearly—Worthless! In the third it is seen to be both possible and useful, but—Old! The foremost invention for many years is now passing through this third epoch, and there is reason to fear that it will be a long and arduous one for Mr. Bell and those who put faith in him.

Before concluding, I wish to point out one statement of yours (the only one) which few Washington people interested in such matters will be found to endorse. You speak of Mr. Lamar's conclusion as "amazing," and you apprehend that it "has surprised no one more than the plaintiffs themselves." My impression is that they were not at all surprised. I know of no person who was. Mr. Lamar is quite intelligent enough to see that there were only two essential questions to be considered, namely: Had a fraud of a certain kind been committed? and, if so, could the Government act? Argument pertinent to these questions could have been soon heard and a decision reached. This was not done; on the contrary, extraneous matter of all sorts calculated to manufacture public opinion was freely admitted, and the hearing, as well as the subsequent consideration of the briefs, was allowed to drag to such a length that it did not require much prophetic capacity to tell in what direction things were drifting. The honest presumption was, and should have been, in favor of the Bell patent; the real effort was to justify a foregone conclusion. ERFINDER.

WASHINGTON, January 26, 1886.

"THREE ACRES AND A COW."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In a recent number of the *Nation* appears a statement from which it would be gathered that the cry of "Three Acres and a Cow" was simply raised by way of derisively summing up an appeal to the baser instincts of our rural electorate in the recent English general elections.

This is very far from being the complete statement of the case. I beg respectfully to call your attention to a pamphlet for which I take as the title the words of which I was the author, 'Three Acres and a Cow.' This expression sums up the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

facts of a very important and interesting state of things on the estate of Lord Tollemache and Cheshire, and is further used by me to enforce, what I believe to be the fact, that by means of similar action throughout the grazing and dairy districts of Great Britain the position of our rural laborer can be enormously improved.

Pardon my intrusion upon your notice, which I would not venture upon did I not believe this question to be a vitally important one to many poor men, and also that I might rely on your courtesy to allow some statement to appear which should put before your readers the true explanation of the words "three acres and a cow."—I am, yours faithfully,

FREDERIC IMPEY.

95 COLMORE ROW, BIRMINGHAM, January 16, 1886.

AN INTERNATIONAL PARCELS POST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Apropos of the communication signed "L." in the *Nation* for January 21, expressing a need for an international parcels post, permit me, as a sufferer from our present defective system, to add my voice to the cry. On two occasions I have been obliged to import small articles, which, being for church purposes, were duty free. Notwithstanding my precaution in having the parcel transmitted in care of the United States Express Company, on each occasion the parcel was, without my order, turned over to certain conscienceless sharks termed "custom-house brokers," who seem to be on hand to "gobble" all packages which are not claimed by the consignee. The only notice which I received of its arrival was through this firm of sharpers, and I was obliged to deal with them, paying all their charges as well as the freight and custom-house "fees." The total amount of the cost of transportation was in each case fully equal to the value of the goods imported. By all means let us have an international parcels post.

F.

January 23, 1886.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: What your correspondent "L." says about the desirableness of our Government's joining the International Parcels Post must be heartily concurred in by anybody who has received such a bill as this:

Duty	$1.10
Custom-house fees	.60
Foreign charges and freight	1.98
Cartage	.75
Storage	.55
Brokerage	2.00
	$6.98

These charges were made upon a package containing about a hundred cubic inches, and weighing two pounds. To bring it from Berlin to New York cost $1.98; to transfer it in New York from the custom-house to the express office cost $3.30.—Respectfully,

LUCIUS HERITAGE.

MADISON, WIS., January 23, 1886.

"AMERICAN SOVEREIGNTY."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The fact that your correspondent, "P. B.," is known as one who has given not a little attention to the above subject, makes his conclusions seem all the more remarkable to those of whom he speaks, who believe that the masterly analysis of Austin has never been shaken, and that sovereignty exists somewhere as a unit in every independent political community.

He says, in substance, "that with us there is no such thing as sovereignty"; that there is no State or people which has no political superior; that "the Federal state and its people—that is, the aggregate people—and also each local State and its people, as to important subjects" have each a superior in the other and are therefore not sovereign; and that, if sovereignty ever existed, it has been divided and destroyed.

This view differs from the common one, which has ever found such abundant expression in our judicial and political literature, wherein it is assumed that sovereignty is divided, "no matter how," between the Federal Government and the States, each being sovereign within its sphere. Neither of these views rises above the agents which American sovereignty employs, and to which it intrusts the execution of its powers. The one claims a complete destruction of sovereignty, merely because of the independence as regards each other of certain of its important agents. The other sees no further than the agents themselves, and because it finds them wielding between them the powers of sovereignty concludes that they are the sovereign parts of a divided sovereignty.

The idea of an independent political community wherein sovereignty does not exist is a mere fancy which has no basis in reason or in fact. And, with all due respect for judicial *dicta* and lay opinion, a divided sovereignty is a contradiction of terms. Sovereignty may create or adopt agents, divide its powers among them and restrict each to its intended sphere, but it cannot itself be subject to any control beyond its own will. "P. B." says that "if sovereignty ever existed, it has been divided, destroyed, no matter how; it no longer exists, it cannot exist with the irrevocable loss of its necessary powers." But, if sovereignty existed, did it divide and destroy itself, or what power divided and destroyed it? What has become of that power? And what authority has "P. B." for saying that the loss of its powers is irrevocable?

That must have been merely a *de jure* sovereignty which could be thus divided and destroyed and have its powers irrevocably distributed. The power that created and adopted the various agencies of government in this country; that delegated and "reserved" to them the sovereign powers which they wield; that defined such powers and restricted their exercise by a written constitution; that from time to time has added further expressions of its will, and that may at its pleasure resume the powers thus placed in the hands of its agents and redistribute them, is sovereign in this country. Its agents are powerful, but they are not sovereign and not beyond its control. It is not the Federal Government. That is merely one of its agents, created and intrusted by it with only a part of its powers. It is not the local State. That is but another agent which is completely subject to its will. Nor is it the aggregate people of the local State. There is no power granted or "reserved" to the local State or its people which may not be taken away *without their consent*. They possess no power which is not held at the will of a power higher and outside of themselves.

This view may not conform to the intent of the framers of the Constitution or to later opinion as to the effect of their work; but, what is of more importance, it conforms to actual facts as they exist. We have now reached a point where we can afford to see the facts as they are, and we shall escape much confusion of thought if we cease to talk of sovereign States and a divided sovereignty.

Yours very truly,

EDWIN BURRITT SMITH.

CHICAGO, January 25, 1886.

EDUCATION FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The last few years have seen the establishment in the United States of three separate "Schools of Political Science"—at Columbia, at the University of Michigan, and at the University of Pennsylvania. In the same time the courses in economic and political science at Harvard, at Johns Hopkins, and at several other of the leading colleges have been vastly improved and extended. It is easy to see a connection between these improvements and the present general movement for the reform of the methods and of the personnel of the public service. The public is beginning to demand that trained efficiency shall be accounted a better recommendation for office than political adroitness. The aim of the newly established Schools of Political Science, we may fairly infer, is largely to supply the general training which is beginning to be demanded of public servants; in effect, they are in large measure established as semi-professional schools of preparation for the civil service.

It is obvious, however, that the training afforded by these schools, being mostly general in its nature, has very little bearing on the preparation for those grades of the public service which at present are approachable by the road of competitive examination. It is equally obvious that until the higher grades also, such as those of the consular service, are made approachable by the same road, the possible usefulness of these schools will be greatly restricted. Until the public service in America is made a profession, such as it is in most of the States of Europe, there will be little use in offering to young men a professional training for it. Until that time arrives, these schools—in so far, at least, as their aim is to provide this training—can only hope to attract a dilettante or an academic clientèle; few young men will be attracted to their courses except by curiosity or with the purpose of fitting themselves as teachers of political science.

More than all this, in considering their programme of studies, one is driven to entertain serious doubts as to whether any one of the three is adapted, even by anticipation, to the end of preparing young men for the higher grades of the public service, even were these grades to be thrown open to competitive examination. When this reform is accomplished, possibly our Schools of Political Science have the intention of rearranging or of enlarging their courses, with the view of directly providing this preparation. I doubt, however, if they would find this practicable.

There are several reasons assignable why none of these schools could supply the need for such a training. In the first place, such a school ought to be situated at the national capital, where is the centre of administration for all the higher grades of the service; secondly, it ought to be independent of any other school or university; and thirdly, its courses ought to be arranged with the greatest possible attention to definiteness of aim and to practicalness of method. In short, *mutatis mutandis*, it should be modelled directly after the plan of the admirable École Libre des Sciences Politiques at Paris. It should be situated at Washington, in order that the bulk of its faculty could be drawn from those actually engaged in the public administration; it should be kept free from official connection with any other school, in order to be saved from any danger of doctrinairism, and in order also to have the greatest possible opportunity for free development in the attainment of its own ends; and naturally it would best attain those ends by always keeping the methods and the matter of its instruction as practical as possible.

The School at Paris to-day supplies a large number of those employed in the higher administrative offices in France, in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in the consular and diplomatic service, in the prefectures, in the inspection of finances, and in the Cour des Comptes, and this School admirably fulfils the three conditions I have named. A majority of its Faculty consists

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of those who formerly have been or actually are in the Government service. Among these are Léon Say, De Foville, Dunoyer, Ribot, and Charmes—names sufficiently well known in French politics. The school stands by itself, with no connection with parties, and, I believe, no Government aid. Its courses are directly arranged to prepare for the civil-service examinations in the several branches of the public service which I have just named. The School is now in its fifteenth year.

All the friends of administrative reform in America are substantially agreed upon the necessity of extending the present civil-service reform to cover all purely administrative branches of the public service. The change is probably only a question of time. When it comes about, measures will surely be taken to establish some sort of a school to fit candidates for the examinations. There is a great number of offices of the higher class under each department at Washington, especially under the Departments of State and of the Treasury, to efficiently fill which the best of preparation could be given by a school definitely organized for that purpose. I have, therefore, considered it worth while publicly to call attention to the example of the Paris School of Political Sciences, and especially to contrast the direct and practical nature of most of its courses with the too academical nature of the courses (from this point of view) of our three American schools. These have doubtless drawn many suggestions and much of their inspiration from the Paris institution; nevertheless, when the time comes it will be practically impossible for them to play the same rôle in relation to our public service which is played by the Paris School in relation to the French public service; it will be impossible for them to take the place of a central, independent school, located at Washington, and having the predominating end in view of preparing its pupils to pass the examinations for the higher grades of civil and diplomatic service.

F. I. Carpenter.

Paris, January 12, 1886.

GEORGE BORROW'S WORKS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I think that Professor Knapp will be glad to add to his list of Borrow's works the following title:

'Faustus, his Life, Death, and Descent into Hell. Translated from the German by G. Borrow.' With Colored Frontispiece. London, 1825. 12mo.

Mr. A. Egmont Hake, in Stephen's 'Dictionary of National Biography' (vol. v, p. 408), gives fresh facts regarding Borrow's writings. Among other works apparently not known to Professor Knapp, he mentions a translation from the Danish of Ewald's poem, "The Death of Balder," and a translation into Turkish of "Blue Beard," which latter is perhaps the same as the posthumously published 'Turkish Jester.' Mr. Hake furthermore states that Borrow's stepdaughter, Mrs. MacAubrey, is in possession of several valuable manuscripts not yet published.

In *Notes and Queries* (1st series, vol. xi, p. 339) is a curious article by Borrow worth looking at; in it he speaks of riding "Lavengro's wild cob." The 'Autobiography' mentioned by Allibone can only be 'Lavengro.'

Lindsay Swift.

Boston Public Library, January 30, 1886.

Notes.

Harper & Bros. have in press 'The Massacres of the Mountains," an illustrated historical work relating to the Indians, by J. P. Dunn, jr.; and part ix. of Dr. J. M. Carnochan's 'Practical Surgery.'

G. P. Putnam's Sons make the important announcement that Prof. Alexander Johnston, of Princeton, has in preparation a 'History of the United States from 1840 down to the Close of 1885,' to be published in the course of the present year. No people more than the American needs to have its records of the immediate past accessible, for none is so forgetful. The same firm will issue 'Documents Illustrative of American History, 1606-1863,' edited and annotated by Howard W. Preston; 'Flights Inside and Outside Paradise: Sketches of Travel in Japan and Elsewhere,' by Geo. Cullen Pearson; and 'Summer Haven Verses,' by James Herbert Morse.

D. C. Heath & Co., Boston, will add to their series of "Educational Classics" Richter's 'Levana.' Moreover, they will begin in February a new monthly periodical, to be called the *Citizen*, and to be edited by the members of the American Institute of Civics, of which the President is Henry Randall Waite.

A new edition of Mr. Charles B. Reynolds's 'Old St. Augustine,' with six fresh illustrations and a "coquina" imitation binding, will be brought out by E. H. Reynolds, of that city.

The Worthington Co. will publish immediately Swinburne's study on Victor Hugo, making a volume of 230 pages.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. will soon publish the seventh volume of Mr. John Burroughs's agreeable studies of out-door life and literature, under the appropriate title of 'Signs and Seasons.'

Ginn & Co. announce Hans Andersen's 'Fairy Tales,' edited for home and school by J. H. Stickney, in three series; and 'Analytic Geometry,' by G. A. Wentworth.

Mr. William Winter is preparing a volume of criticisms of Miss Mary Anderson as an actress, which will be published by Mr. George J. Coombes. In both form and substance it will resemble the volume on 'Henry Irving in New York,' which Mr. Winter wrote and Mr. Coombes published late last spring. There is already an English biography of Miss Anderson, by Mr. Farrar, but it is quite uncritical.

Of the serial novels now appearing in the magazines, Ticknor & Co. will issue shortly Mr. Howells's 'Indian Summer,' and later Mrs. Mary Hallock Foote's 'John Bodewin's Testimony.' Macmillan & Co. will publish Mr. James's 'Bostonians,' both in London and New York, as they did his 'French Poets and Novelists.' It will appear in England in the British three volumes, and in America in the more natural single volume.

Henry Holt & Co. i sue this week 'A Cardinal Sin,' one of two posthumous novels by "Hugh Conway."

D. Lothrop & Co., Boston, will shortly bring out 'Social Studies in England,' by Mrs. Sarah K. Bolton.

The Rev. J. D. Stockbridge, who is engaged upon a catalogue of the Harris Collection of American Poetry, lately devised to Brown University by Senator Anthony, is receiving, we understand, abundant evidence that the work will be taken up on its appearance. The British Museum has already bespoken a copy.

Mr. Wm. Henry Burr, of Washington, is bringing out in parts (Brentano Bros.) a work entitled 'Bacon and Shakspere,' and proving that Bacon wrote the sonnets ascribed to the latter.

'Love Made to Order, and Other Comedies,' by Francis Gellatly (Chicago: Knight & Leonard; 1885), gives little encouragement to the theory of Mr. Stedman that the drama is the coming American form in literature. The three plays of this volume are rapid in movement and contain some farcical situations; they have also the merit of contemporaneity; but the life they depict is of the vulgarest kind, the wit is confined to punning and puerilities of Shaksperian parody, the humor is too often dependent on impure suggestion, and the satire is so generally aimed as to lose effectiveness. The subjects are not in themselves objectionable, but the manner in which they are treated and developed calls for the full measure of disapprobation. The stage could not tolerate them with self-respect; much less can literature admit them.

The garb of the 'Voltaire' which introduces us to the new and uniform edition of the works of Mr. John Morley (Macmillan & Co.) is attractive in the extreme. The volume is a handy duodecimo, bound in wine-colored cloth, and openly printed on paper of excellent quality. One can but contrast it with the second edition of 1871-2, an octavo of much inferior merit typographically, and taking up much more room with its 354 pages than does the present unassuming edition with 365. An historical work in which the foot-notes are not more numerous than in this one, could not choose a better model in all respects. It would be superfluous to praise the contents of the 'Voltaire.'

Mr. Robert Laird Collier has gathered into a very pretty volume, 'English Home Life' (Boston: Ticknor & Co.), half-a-dozen essays on the interior domestic arrangements and customs of the higher-class English families, and he has compressed into these narrow limits an amount of information regarding English daily life which is really wonderful. The reader, and especially "the fair reader," will acquire from it a fund of knowledge both interesting and suggestive. Mr. Collier is not altogether a eulogist, but when he is either dissatisfied or displeased, as any American must be with certain phases of English society, he explains in what way such objectionable things are rooted in the soil and institutions. The chapters on the government of the family and what is called "the atmosphere" of the house in which the children grow up, are especially valuable to those interested in training the young, and we commend them to the attention of reformers anxious to have "morality" taught in the public schools of our country, either with the denominational attachment which President Eliot has patented, or without.

Scribner & Welford have brought out in dainty parchment form Mr. J. Cotter Morison's *étude*, 'Madame de Maintenon,' of which one cannot speak too highly as a delightful essay. Of the extent to which the historical estimate of her enigmatic character is to be modified by the discovery that her letters were seriously tampered with by their first editor, it is as yet impossible to judge. The author follows the traditionary safe course by assuming that she was neither saint nor sinner, and that her rise was not deliberately ambitious from the start, but largely the result of circumstances; her main aim, in his view, was "to make the most of both this world and the next." The sketch is executed with great delicacy of touch, and the passages depicting the scenes at St. Cyr are marvels of picturesqueness, interest, and satire that is wholly good-natured.

Mr. John G. Allen's 'Topical Studies in American History' (Rochester, N. Y.: Scranton, Wetmore & Co.) will be found a very useful aid to teachers of American history. It consists of brief memoranda, extracts from documents, topics for special preparation, and notes for conversation, arranged under chronological heads, but with no attempt at uniformity of treatment in the several periods. The idea seems to be that of the greatest freedom and elasticity. In the margin of nearly every page is given a list of books for reading—histories, biographies, poems, novels, and essays. The compilation of the book shows industry and good judgment.

Mr. Frederick Saunders's 'Evenings with the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sacred Poets' shows, like his other compilations, a wide and catholic taste, and a happy faculty of combining quotation and anecdote with wise observation. The work, which was originally published about ten years ago, is now reissued (by A. D. F. Randolph & Co.) with two additional chapters, on 'Recent American and English Writers,' which continue the stream of sacred song, and reveal a depth of faith in the modern writers like that of the older hymnists. In fact, the ground and reason of the hymn writer is faith and trust; he writes to comfort sorrow or inspire effort, and the bulk of the writers build on the language of the Bible, so that their thoughts move largely in one sphere. Mr. Saunders refers to the more well-known verses of the hymn-books by their first lines only, but among the choicer of the old and the modern English, and from the best translations, especially of the German and the Latin, he quotes many fine examples which are pleasing to read once and refer to often, and he mingles with his quotations numerous interesting biographical statements and anecdotes. Some of Mr. Saunders's "waifs," unacknowledged, at the end of the volume, are so good, and withal so familiar, that one suspects them to be acknowledged. "How easy 'tis to keep sin-free," for instance, is by Coventry Patmore. Two cases of oversight occur in the earlier part of the book, where, under the somewhat general heading, "German—Thirty Years' War," Luther is classed with a few of the writers of that period, and on one page the date of Giles Fletcher's death is given as 1623, and again as 1650, the former being correct; but these are mere oversights.

Silvio Pellico's 'My Ten Years' Imprisonment' forms the first issue in Cassell's ten-cent National Library, according to our recent announcement. It is a little pocket volume of 200 pages, in small but not trying print, and paper covers. Professor Henry Morley supplies a brief introductory sketch of the author.

Besides the text edition of the 'Bacchantes,' edited by Professor Beckwith, of which we spoke last week, there is another edition, with notes, which we had overlooked.

We are glad to record the completion of volume one of Mr. N. Ponce de Leon's 'Diccionario Tecnológico' with the fifteenth number, and to learn that the enterprise has been so well supported that this English-Spanish portion will be directly followed by the Spanish-English. It is a very valuable addition to all existing vocabularies. The publication office is at No. 40 Broadway.

'Recollections of a Book Worm' is the alluring title of a collection of essays on books and book-collecting written by Mr. J. Roger Rees, to be published in London by E. Stock.

We have received from the compiler, Professor Joseph Kürschner, the eighth annual issue of his 'Litteratur-Kalender.' As regards its general features, we can but repeat the praise we have given to former issues. The present volume, however, contains a steel portrait of Hermann Heiberg, perhaps the cleverest of the newer German novelists. In the necrology we notice the names of Karl Andrae, Georg Curtius, Karl Hillebrand, F. Hiller, Karl Richard Lepsius, A. Meissner, Gustav Nachtigal, and Robert von Schlagintweit.

The February number of the *Book-Buyer* appears with a new cover and initial letters by Mr. G. R. Halm, with a portrait of Mrs. Burnett and an account of her methods of work, with the first of Mr. Laurence Hutton's interesting papers on American Bookplates, with a review of Lieutenant Greely's book by ex-Chief Justice Daly, and with other illustrated articles and reviews, the cuts being chiefly borrowed from the books of the month. In one of the advertising pages we note a list of the books published during 1885 by Charles Scribner's Sons, nearly seventy titles in all, not ten of which, or less than fifteen per cent., are the work of English authors. Perhaps twenty years ago the proportion of American books would not have exceeded this. Elsewhere in this number of the *Book-Buyer* we are told that Messrs. Scribner will publish a new guide to Mexico by Mr. Thomas A. Janvier, and two first novels by American authors distinguished in other walks of literature: 'Domesticus,' a social satire in prose, by Mr. William Allen Butler, and 'The Late Mrs. Hull,' a long story by Mr. Frank R. Stockton, one of the most skilful masters of the short story.

The hundredth anniversary of the birth of the brothers Grimm (January 4, 1885—February 24, 1886) has been celebrated by the eminent Icelandic scholars, Vigfusson and Powell, by the publication of a group of essays relating to their studies. There are seven of these essays, besides a "Prologue in Berlin," by G. V., and an "Epilogue in Oxford," by F. Y. P. The first, which gives its name to the volume, is entitled "Sigfred-Arminius," and is an attempt to show that the legend of Sigfred is an outgrowth of the historical career of the great German hero, Arminius. *Hermann*, as an equivalent for this name, the author rejects, holding that *Arminius* was a merely Roman name, and that the real name of the hero must have, according to Germanic custom, contained the same radical syllable as that of his father, *Sigimer*, and other kinsmen, *Segestes*, *Segimund*, etc.; then why not *Sigfred?* The arguments are ingenious and many of them plausible; but, after all, what real ground is there for supposing that *Arminius* was not his true name? A short paper upon the defeat of Varus brings up some interesting illustrations from sagas, etc., of the Germanic custom of felling trees in the way of an advancing enemy—such as Dio's account makes probable in the defeat of Varus. The longest paper is the closing one, by Mr. Powell, upon "Traces of old law in the Eddic lays"; it contains a great deal of interesting matter in the comparative study of ancient law.

Mr. Waters's "Genealogical Gleanings in England," in the January number of the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, touches upon the kinsfolk of the Poores, of Newbury, Mass., and the Hawthornes of Salem, and among other wills gives that of the father of the first Sewall who came over (the ancestor of Judge Sewall), which furnishes the clue to a connection with the Hornes of Salop, and extends the Sewall line one more generation backwards. Mr. Waters has also edited from three contemporary copies in the British Museum a valuable manuscript 'Relation concerning the Estate of New England,' to which the approximate date of 1634 is assigned from internal evidence. A large part of this relation, following some of the MSS., had been printed before, but in a limited private edition. Noteworthy, too, in the same number, is Professor Horsford's discussion of the meaning of three Indian names for Boston, accompanied by several old maps. We can only mention his conclusions: Sha-um-ut (Shawmut), *Near the Neck;* Mushau-womuk, *Canoe-place;* Messatsoosec (Massachusetts), *Great-Hills-Mouth;* Accomonticus (Agamenticus), *Beyond-the-hill-little-cove.* The Neck referred to in "Shawmut" was not the Boston or Roxbury Neck of American history, but one near Haymarket Square, now quite as effectually obliterated as the former by filling in.

A pamphlet report of the commemoration of the bi-centenary of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes on October 22, 1885, by the Huguenot Society of America, is before us. As interesting as any single feature of this celebration is the fact that it was held in a French church in this city organized by the refugees in 1687, and in whose successive edifices "services in the French tongue have been continued from that day to this."

To the January number of the *New York Genealogical and Biographical Record* Mr. Thomas C. Amory contributes a discursive but interesting paper on the Boston-born Admiral, Sir Isaac Coffin, of the British navy. An engraving after Stuart's portrait accompanies it.

Shakespeariana for January (Philadelphia: Leonard Scott Publication Co.) renders a useful service by indicating in detail the differences in the successive editions of Mr. Halliwell-Phillipps's 'Outlines of the Life of Shakspere'—editions for which shelf-room would be lacking in the house of any but a Shakspere scholar, and none of which is provided with an index, or with the tables of contents of its predecessors.

'The Wilderness Road' is the subject and title of the second publication of the Filson Club (Louisville, Ky.: John P. Morton & Co.). Mr. Thomas Speed describes, in an interesting manner, with the aid of rare books and old journals and itineraries, the routes by which emigrants passed from the seaboard into Kentucky, and particularly that by way of the Shenandoah Valley and Cumberland Gap, with the last section of which, the "Wilderness Road," Daniel Boone's name (if not his fame, as ought to be the case) is connected as the pathfinder. Mr. Speed pays a high tribute to the skill with which Boone laid out this thoroughfare (hardly more than a trail for many years).

The elaborate report of the Massachusetts Drainage Commission with reference to the sewage problems offered by the valleys of the Mystic, Blackstone, and Charles Rivers, has just been printed and will command widespread attention. It is accompanied by numerous maps of the basins under consideration, and several photographic views of sewage filters and farms in this country and in England.

A very interesting account of an ascent of the volcano Popocatepetl is given by Prof. A. S. Packard in the February number of the *American Naturalist*. Curious, too, are Mr. C. Brent's "Notes on the Leaf-Cutting Ants of Trinidad." In the Editors' Table, Professor Cope estimates in some detail the expenses of an Academy of Original Research, which he holds up as a suitable monument for any millionaire ready to make the necessary endowment.

The *Hawaiian Almanac* for 1886 reports the population of the islands on December 27, 1884, to have been 80,378, a gain in eight years of 2,393. Japanese immigration began in 1885, the Chinese continues under regulations as to numbers whose evasion causes trouble; and Portuguese are about to arrive again. The editor, in a paragraph on the importation of Christmas toys, classes Hawaiians and Chinese together in contrast to "the foreign population"—meaning Europeans. The islands boast two railroads, one having a station called Spreckelsville—an unlovely compound. There is a capital paper on music in Hawaii. The natives find only the 2-4 or 4-4 time quite natural, and the instrumental band which a skilful German leader has made out of them, has had the most trouble in getting the mazurka or waltz movement. Few of the tunes which this band plays are caught up and whistled by the natives, but the opening chorus of "Pinafore" proved exceptionally taking. The natives play the guitar with great feeling, and of late have acquired the banjo and a "hideous small Portuguese instrument now called 'taro patch fiddle.'" Outside the natives, the writer thinks there is no place in the world "where so many pianos are to be found in proportion to the number of the population."

With its December number *Mélusine*, that delightful folk-lore journal over which MM.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gaidoz and Rolland preside with so much grace and learning, completed its second volume; and seldom has it contained any tales more curious and amusing than the five *historiettes*, Talmud-like but not of the Talmud, taken from an anonymous collection of the sixteenth century. In the January number are continued the Notes and Notelets on popular melodies contributed by Anatole Loquin, in which words and music are given, often with several versions of each.

We have received from Mr. Schoenhof, Boston, the prospectus and the January number of a new periodical, *Les Lettres et les Arts* (Paris: Boussod, Valadon et Cie.). This "revue illustrée," which is published by the successors of Goupil, outdoes in size and price every other literary magazine of France. Each number will form a large quarto volume of 144 pages, besides a *feuilleton* of twelve pages containing literary and artistic notices. It is magnificently printed on the most beautiful paper, and illustrated by some of the first artists. The cost is 30 francs a number, or 300 francs a year (320 francs by post). The name of the editor, M. Anatole France, is a certain guarantee of the high tone which the new review will aim to keep. The present number is rich from both a literary and an artistic point of view. The two most attractive articles are "Le Déisme pendant la Révolution," by M. Frédéric Masson, with its luxury of illustrations, and M. E. Caro's fine criticism of the Abbé Roux's 'Les Pensées d'un Solitaire.' The number opens with a reminiscence of his school-days, "Les Poètes de Collège," by M. Édouard Pailleron. M. Henry Houssaye writes a few pages to accompany the full-page illustration in colors by Detaille, "La Charge." M. Gounod writes on sacred and profane music in illustration of the picture of his nephew, Guillaume Dubufe, which is reproduced. M. Widor contributes the music to accompany a very pretty poem of Sully Prudhomme, and there are interesting articles by MM. Jules Simon, Jules Lemaitre, Leconte de Lisle, José-Maria de Heredia, and others. The whole number is a pleasure to the eye, and the literary value of the text is of the highest kind.

— The mid-winter *Century* opens with a series of illustrations from the works of Barye, whose name and characteristics are not to be unknown to the American public, if the magazines can help it. The cuts are varied and interesting, and amply supply whatever was lacking in the profusely illustrated article which appeared some months ago in *Harper's*. A second pronounced feature of the number is Mr. Cable's account of the Place Congo dances, with the musical scores. He has reproduced the look of the heathenish amusements of the slaves there with surprising vividness, and as much openness as the subject will permit. Mr. Howells's new novel, "The Minister's Charge," also attracts attention. We pass over the pages rapidly, however, to come to the extraordinary chorus of authors demanding international copyright as with the blare of the trumpets before Jericho. Mr. Lowell's quatrain is quotable:

> "In vain we call old notions fudge
> And bend our conscience to our dealing;
> The ten commandments will not budge,
> And stealing *will* continue stealing."

— In the February *Lippincott's* many readers will turn with curiosity to see how Mr. Dorman B. Eaton has met his engagement to "reply" to Gail Hamilton's previous article on the Civil-Service Reform. He begins with a half-apology for having got himself into the disagreeable situation of having to make a rejoinder to a woman whom the only way to answer is to "answer back." As was to be expected, he can find no serious argument or understanding of the matter in hand in "G. H.'s" (Greater Humbug, as he interprets) diatribe, but only a rich and copious vocabulary of fish-wife compliments which he rehearses. It is evidently not pleasanter for him than for others to get into a wordy warfare in such primitive English. He does his best, however, to find something in his antagonist's position capable of serious discussion, and in the most telling part of his article explodes the common word-dodge of those speakers who are continually telling us that the Government has not lost money by the corruption of officials. His examination of the Internal Revenue report for 1881–82 is a final answer to that mischievously plausible argument. In the rest of the magazine we can note only the very carefully finished and delightful story by "J. S. of Dale," whose brief tales are models of literary workmanship. The fidelity of the river-scenes, and the selection of suggestive and memoried detail, together with the charm of the narration, make the most hackneyed and commonplace of simple plots a fresh and true thing. The author shows only one regrettable tendency—to preciosity.

—The new school of historical study has at last created for itself a worthy organ in the *English Historical Review*. Germany and France already possessed similar periodicals. Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift* has for nearly thirty years represented the highest standard of historical work in Germany, and for ten years the *Revue Historique* has done the same for France. These two reviews are not on exactly the same plan. Both contain a certain number of solid articles, generally not more than two or three, presenting in a literary form the results of some special study or exploration. The *Historische Zeitschrift* is then, for the rest, made up of book notices, generally short, but often elaborate and detailed; and, as the books reviewed are for the most part German, one can find here a very complete account of the contemporary historical literature of Germany, while that of other countries is apt to be neglected. The French *Revue*, on the other hand, makes it distinctly its aim to present a complete view of contemporary historical literature, and for this purpose obtains correspondents in every country, who from time to time give elaborate reports upon the recent publications of their own countries. This may be called the distinctive feature of this review. The regular book notices are comparatively few in number; between the "articles de fond" and the "bulletins" there are miscellaneous documents and shorter articles, and at the end there comes a list, several pages long, of all the periodicals in the world which deal with historical questions, with the titles of their articles—often briefly characterized. We have thus a perfect record of historical literature in all countries and all departments. The projectors of the new English *Review* have been able to take advantage of the experience of its predecessors, and to judge where it was best to copy them, and where to supplement them. They have wisely abstained from undertaking to rival the French review in its specialty — the bulletins. This difficult work once done need not be done over again. Apart from this, the *Review* is admirably full and well-arranged in the department of intelligence. The "list of historical books recently published" will be very acceptable to all students; and its "contents of periodical publications," while similar to that in the *Revue Historique*, has the advantage of being arranged by nations, and is thus easier of consultation.

—There are more regular book reviews than in the *Revue Historique*, but not nearly so many as in the *Historische Zeitschrift;* and it seems to us that here if anywhere is the defect of the work—one does not find in it a complete survey of the field of historical composition for England, such as the other two reviews afford for France and Germany. The solid articles occupy, we should judge, rather more space in proportion than is the case with the other reviews. They are five in number, besides a prefatory note. The first is upon German schools of history, by Lord Acton—a very intelligent presentation of the course of historical study in Germany, occasionally a little obscure from a certain allusiveness of style. The next is a short paper upon "Homer and the Early History of Greece," by D. B. Monro, Provost of Oriel, very suggestive in its discussion of the geography of Homer, and the light thrown by it upon primitive history. The Homeric map, he shows, is not merely totally different from the historical map of Greece, but "is also different from the mythical map, as we may call it—that is to say, the map which would have been naturally produced by bringing together the most famous heroes and legends." He thinks that for the birthplace of Homer we must look to Greece proper—Thessaly, Bœotia, or Argolis. Then follows a long and characteristic article by Mr. Freeman upon "The Tyrants of Britain, Gaul, and Spain, 406–411"—very valuable for the student of the period of the migrations. The next article is by Prof. Seeley, "The House of Bourbon." Its real subject is the family compact of 1733—"the most important document of the middle period of the eighteenth century, and the most indispensable to history." The last article is unsigned: "Notes on the Greville Memoirs." Between the articles and the reviews comes a miscellaneous section, entitled "Notes and Documents." Here we find two notes of interest in American history—"Mather and Randolph," by C. E. Doble, and "The Campaign of Gen. Braddock," by J. C. Wilson. This is a very strong and interesting number; and the appended list of contributors promises the maintenance of the same standard. Among them is a considerable number of American names. The review is edited by Rev. Mandell Creighton, author of a history of the papacy, and is published quarterly by Longmans (in this country by the International News Co.). The subscription price is five dollars.

—The fifth volume of Mr. Leslie Stephen's great enterprise, the 'Dictionary of National Biography' (Macmillan), carries the work through Bottisham. The grandees of the present instalment are James Boswell (by the editor), who fills eight pages, Admiral Blake (9 pp.), and Blackstone, of the Commentaries (some 7 pp.). Many legends concerning Blake are set aside in the article devoted to him, nor is his great rival Tromp allowed his traditional broom. Four pages are given to William Blake, the poet and artist, who is sympathetically judged. He is quoted as saying, toward the close of his life, apropos of academic modes of study: "Natural objects always did and do now weaken, deaden, and obliterate imagination in me." Blake made the well-known designs for Blair's "Grave"; and Blair himself is commemorated in the same volume, with an analysis of his single great poem. Four pages are allotted to St. Boniface, who here finds himself in alphabetical company with Mary Blundy, murderess. In four pages, likewise, the career of Admiral Boscawen is sketched, and in three that of Sir Thomas Bodley, founder of the great Oxford library. But the lesser lights possess even greater interest than these, because, for one thing, they are nearer our time, and the common dictionaries have less (or nothing) to tell about them. The Blackwoods, Adam Black, John Black, editor of the *Morning Chronicle* and friend of James Mill; Laman Blanchard, of the *Examiner* and of so many other journals; H. G. Bohn, the Countess of Blessington, Dr. Bleek, of Hottentot fame; George Boole, Mme. Anna Bishop and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

her husband, Sir Henry R. Bishop, that most prolific composer; Peter Borthwick, champion of the West India planters, and hence of a system separating husband and wife at pleasure, yet author of "the Borthwick clause" in the poor law which forbids the separation of couples over the age of sixty on entering the doors of the poor-house—are a few names, taken at random, which one is glad to meet with here. The American interest in this volume is not slight. An ancestor of Longfellow's occurs in that Richard Bonython who settled in Maine in 1631. And here also are William Blackstone, once owner of Boston Common; the Rev. James Blair, the founder and president of William and Mary College; Commander Johnston Blakely, U. S. N., who took his *Wasp* into the British Channel in the war of 1812, and went down, with ship and crew, somewhere in the North Atlantic, probably, in the year 1814; the ill-fated Blennerhasset, the elder Booth, William Birch, painter and engraver, one of Washington's portraitists, etc.

—Part xxi of Grove's 'Dictionary of Music and Musicians' (Macmillan) is of special interest to violinists and to admirers of Wagner's music. To the articles Violin and Violin Playing thirty one pages are devoted, and to Wagner thirty. Other important articles are on Violoncello, Virginal Music, Voice, Volkslied, Vogler, Wallace. The writer of the article on the violin does not believe in the Oriental origin of our bowed instruments: "The harp and lyre were borrowed by the Greeks from Egypt—probably, like the alphabet, through Phœnicia; but here the debt of Europe to the stringed-instrument-makers of the East begins and ends. The Arabic and Hindoo instruments from which Fétis and others deduce the violin evidently belong to a totally distinct family. . . . The fiddle has developed out of the lyre and monochord." The writer shows specifically that every detail of the peculiar form of the modern violin has its acoustic reason for being so and not otherwise: and he gives a full account, with illustrations, of the various odd forms through which the violin's predecessors passed before the one was found which seemed fittest to survive. He protests against "the groundless idea that no good fiddles have been made since the golden age of the Cremona makers, which terminated 120 years ago, and that the secrets of violin-making are lost." The prices of the best Italian instruments range from $1,000 to $2,500. "In the writer's opinion, the prices now paid for old Italian violins, always excepting the very best, are high beyond all proportion to their intrinsic excellence. . . . No one with any real idea of the use of a violin would pay £100 for instruments by Montagnana, Serafin, or Peter Guarnerius, when he could buy a good Vuillaume, Pressenda, or Lupot for from £20 to £30; yet the writer has constantly known the first-named prices realized for Italian instruments of decidedly inferior merit." Nevertheless, many of the best violin-makers seldom make new instruments, their principal occupation being the purchase, restoration, and sale of old ones. A violin consists of seventy distinct parts, each of which must be studied separately, and "the restoration of old instruments demands a knowledge of the fiddle which is wider and deeper than that required for the mere fiddle maker." The article on violin-playing gives an interesting account (with a table) of the various "schools" of violinists and their peculiarities. The writer thinks there can be no doubt that the number of good violinists is very much greater at the present time than it ever was before. The article on the violoncello is good enough so far as the instrument is concerned; but when Mr. Payne comes to talk about the compositions for it, the English Mendelssohn madness crops out again. He not only declares Mendelssohn's weak and artificial sonatas to be among the finest works in the 'cellist's repertory, and laments that his intention of writing a concerto was frustrated by his death, but takes occasion to sneer at Schumann's Concerto, the slow movement of which, as a matter of fact, brief as it is, has more genius in it than anything Mendelssohn ever wrote. Nor is this all. Mr. Payne mentions and commends 'cello compositions by such composerlings as Dotzauer, Kummer, Lee, Viotti, and even Offenbach (!), but has not a word to say about Rubinstein's two magnificent sonatas for 'cello and piano, his equally fine concertos, and his three morceaux; or Chopin's highly poetic Sonata, which disputes with Rubinstein's Second Sonata the honor of being the best composition ever written for 'cello and piano. We may remark, by the way, that one of the most significant things about Rubinstein's genius is that the English have not yet "caught on" to it, whereas Mendelssohn they took to heart at once. A failure of immediate appreciation in England, as experience shows, prognosticates the immortality of musical genius.

—It is most unfortunate that this dictionary, otherwise so excellent, should be edited so largely from the Mendelssohnian point of view. Many of the articles are in consequence not up to date, and Dr. Grove would do well to publish a special supplement giving "post-Mendelssohnian" information. In this respect Dr. Riemann's 'Musik-Lexicon' is vastly superior to Grove's. There is, however, one article in the issue under consideration which is fully abreast of the times. Mr. Dannreuther's article on Wagner is the best of its length ever written in any language, extensive as is the Wagnerian literature. He does not waste his space by incidentally lamenting what Mendelssohn did not do, but tells us what Wagner did accomplish. The article comes upon us as timely as a magazine essay just at present, when two or three of Wagner's operas are heard here every week. Mr. Dannreuther arranges his material under four heads—biographical and personal; literary; musical; chronological lists, and a list of valuable books on Wagner and his music. Dannreuther is well read in Wagner's ten volumes of literary works, and wherever possible he introduces the composer's own words on biographical and critical points. He has also been so fortunate as to have access to Wagner's privately printed autobiography, which he repeatedly quotes from. Particularly full are the details regarding Wagner's early life in Paris and his struggles for fame and bread, which were so severe that at one time he applied—in vain—for a place as a "choriste" at a small boulevard theatre: "I came off worse than Berlioz when he was in a similar predicament. The conductor who tested my capabilities discovered that I could not sing at all, and pronounced me a hopeless case all round." Brief résumés are given of Wagner's principal æsthetic treatises, the secrets of his instrumentation are explained, and his opinions of and relations to other composers made clear. A striking portrait of his appearance, habits, and temper is drawn on page 365.

—'Translations from the Poems of Victor Hugo,' by Henry Charrington (London: Walter Scott; New York: Scribner & Welford), and 'Selections Chiefly Lyrical from the Poetical Works of Victor Hugo,' now first collected by Henry Llewellyn Williams (London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Scribner & Welford), agree in lacking an English version of Hugo's only sonnet. Dean Charrington's is the more scholarly of these two attempts to render Hugo's poetry into English verse—a task of unspeakable difficulty and danger; and on the whole it is the more satisfactory. There are several poems in Mr. Williams's collection far more finely translated than any in Dean Charrington's, but the general average of the single-handed version is very much higher than that of the eclectic. We are inclined to believe that a selection of the best translations from any very popular poet ought to be more successful than the attempt of any single translator can hope to be. No foreign poet, for example, has been as adequately represented in England as Ferdinand Freiligrath, whose daughter chose the best English renderings of his lyrics, herself translating only those which had not already been translated advantageously. But this method calls for finer taste and sounder judgment than Mr. Williams possesses, and his selection of the English translations of Hugo is very unsatisfactory and misleading. Of course, he has included some admirable verses, by Mr. Lang, Mr. Garnett, "Father Prout," Toru Dott, and other competent translators; but his own work is in general hopelessly wrong in form and in spirit. Dean Charrington's collection is of uneven quality, but it never sinks so low as Mr. Williams's. Of course, no one has been bold enough to venture on English versions of the "Djinns" and the "Pas d'Armes du Roi Jean"—as characteristic of the French poet as they are untranslatable.

—Whoever has visited the Plantin Museum at Antwerp will be attracted by the first of a series of articles on Rubens and Balthasar Moretus, by Max Rooses, curator of the Museum, in No. 518 of *L'Art* (Macmillan). The visitor sees on the walls original paintings by Rubens, and in the cases his sketches for title-pages beside the printed designs, the engraved plates, and the painter's receipts for his pay. Among the scrupulously preserved papers of the grandson of Christopher Plantin are many evidences of his close relations, in friendship and in business, with his old schoolmate, and M. Rooses's investigations have enabled him, as he does in this article, to throw much light on Rubens's career, and on the dates of some of his works. A fine portrait of Moretus is reproduced in connection with the text. Rubens reappears in another article, with a disagreeable subject, "Demoniacs in Art," which has many curious illustrations from a great variety of sources. In etchings, the December numbers 518 and 519 have a holiday richness: a group portrait of Fr. Snyders and his wife, after Van Dyck; a Flemish interior, also involving a formal portrait of man and wife, after G. Coques; and a fancy "January," typified by a dangerous young woman in furs. Add a photogravure showing a newly discovered Madonna and Child by Mantegna, as it now is, and as it lately was—painted over so that its origin was not suspected by the custodians of the art museum at Brera. No direct indication is given that the right-hand view is the restored one, but one's doubts are set at rest in the *Illustrazione Italiana* for January 10. The book notices are much more numerous than usual, and naturally deal with illustrated works, giving samples of the engravings. One such, from 'Manners and Caricature in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland,' shows "the ship of the Caucus," having on board the Genevan authorities, called by their enemies, as we are told in a foot-note, "Caucus (petit clou, petite association fermée)"—*i. e.*, a close corporation. The *Courrier de l'Art* for December 17 reports the very amusing debate on the subject of the rejection of certain paintings offered to the Louvre by a public-spirited group of private art lovers. The attack on the Ministry of Fine Arts was very discursive, and had a party bitterness, the Radicals calling for the discharge of all the "reactionaries" connected with the Louvre. The proprietor of *L'Art* being involved, to his credit, in the controversy, the *Courrier* gives a spirited editorial comment on the debate, revealing, among

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other things, the long-standing jealousy of *L'Art's* rival, the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*.

—Decidedly the most attractive, and probably the most heroic, figure among the Protestant commanders of Germany in the Thirty Years' War is Duke Bernhard, of Weimar. Young in years and spirit throughout his warlike career—he was born in 1604 and died in 1639—brave, chivalrous, learned, keen of perception, steady in his aims, quick in action, unflinching in adversity, he was worthy to avenge Gustavus Adolphus at Lützen (1632), and succeed him in command. Nor did he lose his prestige by the defeat at Nördlingen (1634), where he met overwhelming forces. But he accepted the Emperor's pardon after Tilly's victory at Lutter (1627); he incurred Oxenstiern, the great Swedish Chancellor's, suspicions, and concluded agreements with Richelieu which secured him princely advantages under the protection of France; and on his death his trusted lieutenant, Erlach, surrendered his stronghold and troops to that foreign and Catholic Power. Can he, in the light of all this, be considered a German patriot, true and steadfast? Goethe made an effort to compose a life of the hero of Weimar, but gave up the task, being unable to get at a clear conception of his subject. The historian Luden had the same experience. Röse's biography ('Herzog Bernhard der Grosse von Saxen-Weimar, mit Urkunden,' 2 vols., Weimar, 1829), presents no solution. Dr. von Gonzenbach, who devoted three volumes to the life of Erlach ('General Hans Ludwig von Erlach,' Bern, 1880-82) warns his readers not to seek in Bernhard a patriotic hero according to the conceptions of our time: he was no more than a brilliant princely *condottiere*. Entirely different, however, is the view taken by Prof. Gustav Droysen, the younger historian of that name and biographer of Gustavus Adolphus, whose 'Bernhard von Weimar' (2 vols., Leipzig, 1885) is the product of many years of research in the archives of Dresden, Gotha, Paris, and Stockholm. If Droysen's picture is correct, Bernhard was not only the noblest type of a warrior of his age, but a German patriot in the truest sense of the word. Protestant Germany will be prone to accept this decision.

THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY'S DICTIONARY.

A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles; founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society. Edited by James A. H. Murray, LL.D. Part II.—Ant—Batten. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 1885.

In the crowd of serials that are constantly appearing, it may seem a little out of the way to claim a place for the Dictionary of the Philological Society, the second part of which now comes up for examination. Yet we doubt if the most popular of them all will, for an educated man, surpass this work in interest; we are sure that nothing but a production of genius could pretend to rival it in permanent value. It is without any intention of reviving or referring to the venerable jokes connected with publications of this kind that we remark that delay, such as has existed, in bringing out successive portions would naturally tend to the destruction of general or sustained interest in this enterprise. It is nearly a year since the first part was noticed in these columns, and more than a year has intervened between the appearance of the two parts; but a delay of this kind, inevitable in this instance, will probably never take place again. The work of digesting the material is now well in hand, and arrangements have been perfected by which the successive parts will appear with comparative regularity. It is expected, indeed, that the letter B will be finished early in the present year, and that hereafter publication of the successive portions will occur once every six months.

To come to particulars, the present part contains all the words from *Ant* to *Batten*. The total number explained in it is 9,135. As *A* is now finished with over fifteen thousand words, and as this letter contains in dictionaries of English about one-sixteenth of the alphabet, the editor calculates that in the completed work there will be comprised about 240,000 words. This is practically double the number found in the largest existing dictionaries, to say nothing of the altogether fuller treatment that is bestowed in this upon each of the entries. We venture to add, moreover, that this will be found an under rather than an over-estimate. It will certainly be so if the process of reading for it is kept up while the various parts are successively going through the press, and this we assume will be the case. The plan which has been adopted, or at any rate the one which has been followed, admits on a generous scale the formations of the hour. We do not believe in its advisability, because it can never be made exhaustive, and, if it could, would add little appreciable value to the work; but the adoption of the principle insures a pretty constant supply of new words, and it will be strange if the latter portion of the alphabet is not swelled, in consequence, beyond its legitimate proportion.

This second part, it may be said in general terms, is far more interesting than the first. It contains comparatively few of those words which made the latter seem, on a hasty glance, more like a technical lexicon of science than a purely English dictionary. It has cost, moreover, far more labor in its preparation; and it is a pleasure to bear witness to the skill, the judgment, and the thoroughness with which the work has been done. The editor has certainly earned the right to speak with gratification of the result accomplished, as well as with some feeling of the labor involved. Statistics can never give a satisfactory idea of the time and thought expended upon any point. Still, one does get a rough conception of the magnitude of the task that has been undertaken and accomplished when he finds forty-two closely printed columns given up to *Anti* and its compounds, twenty-four to *Back* and its compounds, and seven columns to the various uses of the preposition *At*. There is, in fact, not a page in this part in which even the general reader will not find much to interest, nor one from which the profoundest scholar will not gather information. As a single instance of the way in which this mass of illustrative quotations becomes self-explanatory, the word *babery* invites attention. This, in an older form, has long been one of the puzzling words in Chaucer, in whose writings it occurs once. It evidently perplexed the ancient copyists as much as it has done later commentators. It appears in the different manuscripts and editions as *babeuries*, *babeuwryes*, *babeweuries*, *rabewyures*, and *rabewynnes*. The latter forms, which are the ones now usually found in print, originated, without doubt, from the confusion of capital *B* with *R*. The illustrative quotations from other writers not only settle the spelling of the word, but also fix its meaning as "antic shapes" in architecture, which is the very sense the context in Chaucer may be almost said to require.

From the philological point of view this work is peculiarly strong. It is strong not merely for what it says, but for what it refrains from saying. The editor is utterly free from any desire to make conjecture take the place of knowledge in etymology, and the caution he shows in matters of derivation is a most welcome, and, we may add, a rather unexpected proceeding in productions of this kind. In truth we think so highly of the work as a whole, and of the manner in which it has been executed, that it seems a particularly ungracious task to call attention to shortcomings in details. The great merits of the dictionary so overbalance any petty defects that to speak at any length of the latter is liable to make the criticism misunderstood by the careless reader as well as resented by the careful editor. Yet, as was pointed out in the notice of Part 1, there are deficiencies in the work, some of which are doubtless slips practically unavoidable in an undertaking of this magnitude, but others of which seem to us to arise from the deliberate choice of a wrong method.

Naturally what would most attract attention at first in this country is the treatment of American usage. In this matter we are generally impressed with the accuracy of the work. We shall probably not be far out of the way in supposing that this state of things must be due largely to the supervision of Mr. Fitzedward Hall, whose valuable linguistic communications have appeared more than once in the columns of this journal. Whatever sins there are, are usually sins of omission. The feeling, too, comes over one at times, in examining the dictionary, that no great harm would have been done had this particular kind of sin been extended in some cases to the writers from whom the quotations have been made. The point of view, however, is everything in the matter of words as of usages, and our surprise at certain things which fail to appear as well as at some which do appear may not be shared by the intelligent Briton. Yet what member of the old anti-slavery party, with its forty years of bitter political agitation and the waste of wealth and loss of blood in the four years of war it indirectly caused, can help feeling a slight shock of amazement at not finding its title explained in the forty-two columns devoted to *Anti-* and its compounds, and barely recorded at the beginning as a specimen of a "synthetic combination"? What American, too, has not heard of the Argonauts of '49, the adventurers who, in seeking the shores of the Pacific, faced fearlessly perils greater than Grecian hero ever encountered, and direr than Grecian poet ever dreamed? Even some Englishmen must have heard of Bret Harte's 'Tales of the Argonauts'; but if they have, they have not thought fit to communicate their knowledge to the compilers of this dictionary. If these can be counted errors on the side of too little, there are others on the side of too much. *Approbate* for "approve," we learn, is "often used in the United States." The sole instance given is from the year 1849, where it is cited from the Proceedings of some Philological Society which seems then to have existed. We do not deny the verb "used," though we have never heard the word or heard of any one employing it; but we do deny the adverb "often." There is one singular instance of editing, which reminds us of the *logicize* of Bartlett's Dictionary. To an American authoress, Mrs. Whitney — whose writings seem to have been read for this work with special zeal, and to have contributed several formations previously unknown to the language—is credited the word *asideness*. To this is appended [U. S.] in brackets. Now the addition, if it means anything, means that the term is an Americanism. But in order that a term shall properly be called an Americanism, it ought surely to be used by a number of Americans, to say the least. It is an utter misapplication of its meaning to include under it the coinage of an individual writer, which is so far from being found in the common speech that it has probably never been heard or seen save in the productions of its originator. Moreover, if it be properly added here, it has been improperly omitted after *apparition* as a verb, and several

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other words, to which there is precisely the same reason to append it.

Again, in the definitions of Americanisms there is sometimes a lack of precision, due to a lack of knowledge, which will be certain to mislead the ignorant reader who consults the work. *Barnburner*, for illustration, is given as a nickname of a section of the Democratic party in the United States. It was never employed outside of New York, and is now practically forgotten there along with many other similar terms which the faction fights in that State have brought into temporary existence. In like manner *banter* is given as a word used in this country with the sense of challenging to a race or shooting-match. To the vast majority of Americans it would be as strange a meaning as it could possibly appear to an Englishman. The authority from which these terms are taken specifies the places where they are used; and to neglect this limitation is as misleading in an English dictionary as it would be for a peculiarity of the East-Anglian dialect, for instance, to be credited in an American dictionary to the whole of England. But, after all, the most inexplicable thing in this work in its treatment of usage as found in this country is its failure to admit the spelling *armor* along with *armour*—a failure made more significant by the fact that it is careful to say that etymologically the spelling is properly *armure*. It is not a matter about which any one will be much concerned. In a language where every scholar recognizes the orthography as disreputable, the form given to a single word is not a thing to treat with special seriousness. Still, a fact is a fact, and it is the first business of a dictionary to recognize and record it. The fact in this case is that full one-half of the English-speaking race, if not more, spell this word as *armor*, and are likely to continue doing it; and it is no recognition of the fact to put this method of spelling among the variant forms which have been found from the thirteenth century to the present time. Webster and Worcester give only the form *armor*: they do not even admit the existence of *armour*. But a great dictionary of the language, such as is this, has no business to adopt national peculiarities and preferences, still less individual opinions.

This discussion leads naturally to the subject of possible divergences that already exist or may spring up between the language as used in England and in this country. To many readers it will be a surprise to learn that in the popular speech the "autumn" of the former country begins and ends a month earlier than that of the latter. There are certain senses of words put down here as archaic, also, which strike an American with some astonishment. One of these is the meaning of getting up from sitting or kneeling which belongs to *arise*. This verb, to be sure, is not so common with us as the simpler form *rise*; but that it never was anywhere in any period of its history. We venture to say that no one in this country would hesitate about using it in this sense, or would think it strange to hear it used by any one else. There are, indeed, many words which belong much more to the language of writing than of conversation, but it would certainly be questionable to register them as archaic simply because, after having belonged to the language of the latter, they had passed over almost entirely to that of the former. Again, have *apparel* and *assisting* ever been much employed in the spoken tongue? If they have not, is it not misleading therefore to represent them as they are represented here as going out of use? And while on this subject of possible divergences it may be worth while to say that in this country *apothecary* is only a 'druggist'; but we must add that it is impossible to make out from the definition found in this work what is his precise position in England.

It is on the purely literary side, however, that this dictionary displays any real weakness, and it displays that only by contrast with the strength of the philological treatment which characterizes it. It cannot be insisted upon too strongly that a great work of this kind, which is destined to remain a conspicuous literary monument for generations, should be not merely a record of usage, but of the very best usage. If a choice of two examples equally good has to be made, the greater author is to be selected in preference to the less. It is only peculiar appositeness that can justify appealing to the latter rather than to the former. The rule is certainly often violated in this dictionary, and possibly is not accepted. Were we disposed to felicitate ourselves upon the progress of what are sometimes supposed in England to be American ideas, we might point to the literary impartiality shown in this work as rather a striking illustration of their spread. Certainly the doctrine that one man is as good as another has never been more consistently and thoroughly carried out in the case of authors. If it be the main aim of a lexicographer to show the wealth of written matter that has been put under contribution for his work, such a course may be a fitting one. But if it really be, as it seems to us it should be, his aim to give in every instance the highest attainable authority for every usage of every word, it is not a course to be recommended. We cannot be expected to be thankful for a gift of pebbles, when pearls could have been furnished as easily. The fundamental principle to be adhered to in undertakings of this character is that all the works of all the great writers should be gone over most religiously; that the examination of them should be exhaustive; that no usage of theirs, no opinion of theirs on word or on usage, should be left unrecorded. Especially ought this rule to be followed in the case of words which are of comparatively rare occurrence. No quotation from an inferior author should, under such circumstances, ever be cited in preference. How much more weight would attach to *bacchanalias*, and *bacchanal* in the sense of "drunken orgy," with quotations that might have been taken from Milton and Dryden instead of the obscure writers of their times from whom the extracts given are derived! There is a special application of *avatar* in the title of the poem which contains Byron's terrific attack upon George IV., which ought to have found place here. "I rejoice," writes Gray to Walpole in 1751, "to find you *apply* (pardon the use of so odious a word) to the history of your own times." He corrects in another letter Walpole's use of *arrive* for "happen." This is the sort of literary opinion—entirely independent of its correctness or incorrectness—which ought always to be set down in a great national dictionary, whenever writers of the first authority have given expression to it. It is usually set down in this work; that it is not so invariably is doubtless the fault of the readers rather than that of the editor. Still, that there should be any failure at all, detracts somewhat from that satisfactory feeling of absolute trust in its completeness which we should all like to entertain. This demand for completeness, it is to be remarked, is asked only in behalf of the greatest authors. It is to deficiencies in their case alone that any criticism of ours is confined. While this dictionary nearly fulfils all that can be demanded, it does not fulfil it so perfectly that we can feel certain beyond all question that, in the treatment of any single great author's vocabulary, the last word has been spoken; we mean, of course, the last word in the light of present knowledge, and not in that of future.

Let us take Chaucer as an illustration. We specify him because he is an author who deserves special consideration, not merely for his position in regard to our early literature, but on account of the increasing interest which is now taken in his writings, and the neglect which his vocabulary has received from previous lexicographers. One explanation of a perplexing word has already been given; and this is far from being the only one to be found here. But along with this generally full and accurate treatment of Chaucer's language, there is occasional wobbling which at times leaves on the mind an unpleasant impression. Urry's edition is quoted; it is not an edition that deserves to be even looked into. In the "Knight's Tale," Venus, in the council of the gods, after the defeat of Palamon, her favorite, says, "I am ashamed douteles." She means of course that she has been brought into discredit by the result. This is a sense that is not recorded here, though it is fair to add that it is one which can be inferred from a signification given to the verb. In the "Man of Law's Tale," the famous crux, *atazir*, which baffled generations of scholars, and which has only recently been explained, is here conspicuous by its absence. The same is true of *apiked*, one of the words of the Prologue. *Avauntour*, not in the general sense of 'boaster,' but in the special sense of 'a boaster of female favor,' is not found. The use of *on* with *assent* ("Troilus and Criseide," ii, 1,300) is not recorded. We could give a few other instances in the treatment of the vocabulary of this one author which are not entirely satisfactory, but a very large number where insignificant writers of or near his period have been cited in preference to him. These latter omissions, which are doubtless made intentionally, seem to us serious defects. Not so the others referred to, which are far from being numerous at most, and against the occasional occurrence of which it would require almost supernatural insight and oversight to guard.

In the way of more general criticism we notice the failure to record the special use of *author* in the sense of 'editor.' This was certainly a common employment of the word during a large part of the last century. It is "to the author of the *Gentleman's Magazine*," "to the author of the London *Evening Post*," and all similar daily, weekly, and monthly periodical publications that communications were then directed. Occasional omissions occur of words used in the text. *Apple-jack*, we are told, is the name in America of apple-brandy; in the East of England of an apple-turnover. But what is an apple-turnover? The dictionary does not tell us, and while we can guess at its meaning, we cannot be certain of it. Under *aphis* it is said that the aphides are sometimes called 'ant-cows.' But he who meets with the latter word must know also its scientific name, for it has by itself no place or explanation in this work. Nor, coming to a question that belongs to philology rather than lexicography proper, do we believe that the preterite *aris* was derived from the past participle. The theory which originates forms like "sprung," "flung," and many others now in use, together with "smit," "ris," "aris," "strid," and others once employed but now discarded, from an intrusion of the past participle into the preterite instead of from the plural of the preterite, seems to us untenable. It is not implied by this that the participle had no influence, only that it is not from that quarter that the forms mentioned actually came. But the subject is too large to justify here anything beyond an expression of dissent.

There are other things of which we had purposed to speak, but we have left ourselves no space for their discussion. They concern, however, like most of what has gone before, only matters of detail, and do not affect the substantial value of the work, which can safely defy the most hostile criticism that is ever likely to be directed against it. This is, indeed, a dictionary that no one, who seeks to make even the most su-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perficial study of our tongue, can afford to be without. It cannot be long before the possession of it will be regarded as a necessity by every man of education; and in the confident assurance of the coming of that time, its projectors may rest satisfied that it will be as successful from the financial point of view as it is already honorable from the point of view of scholarship.

RECENT NOVELS.

The Ghost's Touch, and Other Stories. By Wilkie Collins. Harper's Handy Series.

The Sacred Nugget.—Self-Doomed.—Christmas Angel. By B. L. Farjeon. Harper's Handy Series.

Houp-là. By John Strange Winter. Harper's Handy Series.

The Old Factory.—Ralph Norbreck's Trust. By William Westall. Cassell & Co.

Babylon. By Grant Allen. D. Appleton & Co.

The Unforeseen. By Alice O'Hanlon. Harper's Franklin Square Library.

Goblin Gold. By May Crommelin. Harper's Handy Series.

rimus in Indis. By M. J. Colquhoun. Harper's Handy Series.

The Rabbi's Spell. By Stuart C. Cumberland. D. Appleton & Co.

King Solomon's Mines. By H. Rider Haggard. Cassell & Co.

Nuttie's Father. By Charlotte M. Yonge. Macmillan & Co.

Cabin and Gondola. By Charlotte Dunning. Harper's Handy Series.

The Story of Margaret Kent. A Novel. By Henry Hayes. Boston: Ticknor & Co.

Vergebens. Roman von Maria Werkmeister. Chicago: Franz Gindele Printing Co. 1885. 244 pp.

It is written in the signs of the times that unless potential novelists shall have a new revelation, the plain story-teller must soon become a dodo of literature. The evil day is so near at hand that a volume of tales by Wilkie Collins is a boon to the host whose only conviction about the art of fiction is, that it was discovered, or invented, or decreed, by some beneficent being solely for the mental distraction of travellers through this working-day world. To the literary reader, no matter what may be his estimate of the intrinsic worth of Collins's stories, or of their rank as intellectual creations, there is pleasure in contemplating work done by a method clearly perceived and thoroughly mastered. Collins understands his own resources so exactly that scholastic warfare and dilettante counsel are alike impotent to disturb or to confuse him. Among the younger breed of novelists, who take their profession solemnly, the feeling about Collins is that "any fellow could do that if he would." The severe and binding character of his method is contemptuously ignored. There is no eagerness to discern that a mastery of it implies the possession of many unusual qualities, such as a correct sense of selection, accurate knowledge of the force of dramatic surprise and climax, and a nice judgment about the fitness of a word to its place. It demands, too, the power to perceive an inevitable end before the first paragraph is written—a power which the young fry apparently either consciously despise or have developed away from. Collins always proposes to himself a strange and unexpected dénouement, frequently an improbable or unnatural one. He invariably plays upon the inexhaustible reserves of curiosity, and from the beginning imposes upon his reader the obligation to discover the secret he holds, whether after all his secret be worth revealing or not. He knows, too, how to compel close attention, and is so ingenious in the contrivance of routes to his goal that, though they may be long, winding, and perplexing, they rarely fatigue. Only after the end is reached do we reflect on the lack of grace, polish, atmosphere, and proclaim that our taste has been violated, our sensibility shocked, by the author's pronounced mannerisms and intrusive eccentricities.

In his last volume, "The Ghost's Touch" and "Percy and the Prophet" develop the influence of supernatural agency on worldly affairs. Both have the author's distinguishing merit of method, and the latter has, in addition, two or three interesting characters. Mr. Blowmore, the eloquent advocate of the British citizen's rights, the protector of the unwritten Constitution, is almost a bit of burlesque; he certainly insinuates enough absurdity into the tale to suggest that all the wonderful occurrences narrated presented themselves to the author in a ludicrous light. The third story, "My Lady's Money," is excellent. In a degree it refutes the accusation that Collins in every instance sacrifices character to movement. Here the ten characters, including the terrier, "Tommie," are so distinct that they not only account for what they did and left undone under existing circumstances, but they convey a lively notion of what they would do in a totally different set of emergencies. Though the story is short, this effect is achieved without any evidence of haste or incompleteness.

Until Mr. Farjeon resolved to establish his claim to the title of novelist, by issuing a volume of fiction every two or three months, he was an acceptable story-teller, over-fond of calling on the rains to beat and the winds to blow a significant accompaniment to his drama, but still with something novel to say, and an agreeable way of saying it. He used not to appear so much like Dickens as he does now, or, at all events, he did not appear so much less than Dickens. The longest of his three recent volumes is the romance of 'The Sacred Nugget.' The scene is in Australia when the gold fever was at its height. Mike Patchett, the lucky finder of the cross-shaped nugget and of tons of precious ore, is Boffin reduced to bathos; Mrs. Whitmarsh is a colonial echo of Mrs. Wilfer; Mr. Horace Blakensee recalls Eugene Wrayburn and Mortimer, though neither of those gentlemen, peculiar as were their tricks to emphasize their social position, ever hit upon the distinguished device of incessantly polishing his finger-nails in public. In 'Self-Doomed,' the chief figure, Gideon Wolf, is introduced, labelled by the author, incomparable villain. The record of his uniformly wicked behavior reveals nothing to discredit the label, but is a wholly uninteresting confirmation of its descriptive truth. In 'Christmas Angel,' which is the best of the three because it has some sympathy and purpose, Farjeon expresses the philanthropic spirit of the times, as Dickens, in all his work, gave words to a tempest of humanitarian sentiment in the man. When Scrooge went off with the Christmas ghosts, he was wafted along by the strength of Dickens's personal desire that all the world should have roast-beef and plum-pudding on Christmas Day. When "Charlie's father" is led by the wraith of his son through scenes from which he awakens a sadder and wiser man, one feels that Mr. Farjeon is part of a "movement," and that he is thus contributing his share toward its advancement. If the imitation of Dickens were limited to catching up and carrying on his sympathy for suffering and his charity for sin, no word of adverse criticism could be spoken, but a copy of his melodramatic, sentimental manner is offensive. Dickens's versatility, his superb vitality, his inexhaustible spontaneity, place him beyond the canons of taste and form. His extravagances were his own, and their brilliant idiosyncrasy condoned their falseness. For that very reason he is the worst sort of a literary model.

The sketch 'Houp-là,' by the author of 'Bootles' Baby,' illustrates the best modern method of stimulating compassion for human misery and admiration of heroic qualities. It is a simple, straightforward, dramatic rendering of a bit of real life, in its movement subjecting character to the finest test. Bootles, who reappears, establishes himself as a figure in literature, a typical contradiction of the sneer that heroism went out with periwigs and ruffles.

If all the novelists who conceive the expression of a moral meaning to be the ultimate object of art, could convey their meaning as artistically as the author of 'Houp-là' (who, rumor says, is a woman), much splendid argumentative talent might pine and die for want of an attractive subject of discussion. But the numbers of tentative, uncertain, unskilful efforts bid fair to keep what the "Gamps" call "arguefiers" busy for many a day. The utilitarian fiction dedicated to the service of the Lancashire workingman is, in itself, a bonanza of disquisition. Mr. William Westall, in 'The Old Factory' and 'Ralph Norbreck's Trust,' has hesitated between the relative artistic values—or, can it be, relative drawing power?—of stern reality in Lancashire dialect and wild romance in glittering rhetoric. As a consequence, he has produced neither good contributions to social science nor blood-curdling adventure, and he has done nothing at all to relieve harassed inquirers into the mission and meaning of art.

Mr. Grant Allen, in 'Babylon,' has not quailed before the immensity of this problem, as far as it affects or is affected by painting and the plastic arts. The human interest in his novel is soon exhausted. Neither the American landscape painter, nor the Dorset peasant sculptor, nor any one of the more prominent characters, has a breath of the vitality imparted to Cecca, the queen of the Roman models. She is the conventional passionate, revengeful, unscrupulous Italian; but she lives, and in her alone the author shows power as a painter from the life. The curious reader, however, will turn over the pages twice to quarrel or agree with the art criticism, to be amazed and amused by the display of philological prejudice. Though there is no definite confession of faith, the essence of Mr. Allen's artistic creed undoubtedly is, that the highest, and indeed only considerable, object of art is to express beauty, and that that expression has reached perfection when the beauty of the spirit is made visible through the beauty of the form. The artist's moral lesson to humanity is taught through the spiritual elevation which contemplation of his work excites. Hiram Winthrop accomplished this mission by his sensitive paintings of his native woods and weeds and marshes; Colin Churchill, through the spiritualization of noble and heroic form in marble. It is easier to assent to Mr. Allen's creed than to approve his expression of it. The technical, critical phrases, strangely out of place in a novel, would be pedantic if they were not purely journalistic. Their unfitness is peculiarly noticeable, considering Mr. Allen's sensitiveness about the use and sound of words. What he calls the "Great American Language" has offended him deeply, and through the story runs a strain of peevish comparison between harsh, shrieking American corruptions, and "pretty, melting" Dorset dialect, dignified by the appellation "West Saxon of the Court of King Alfred." Preference of a burr to a twang is a matter of taste, but faithful reproduction of dialect is a matter of close observation and delicate perception of sound, and memory. After reading Mr. Allen's reproduction of the rural dialect of New

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

York State, one can define the imaginative passages of 'Babylon.' Some of his objections to verbal usages in America, though captious, are valid; but when he disparages *sick*, as an Americanism, one wonders if, for instance, he habitually reads Calphurnia's message to the Senate, "Say he is *ill*."

The opening scenes of 'The Unforeseen' are in a *habitan* village in the heart of the Canadian forests. The French Canadians are a comparatively unwritten people, and offer to the novelist a field where reality is almost one with romance and picturesqueness. Miss O'Hanlon, like several other novelists who have attempted it, begins very well, but abandons her fine opportunities for the attraction of conventional background to her figures. Though Mme. Vandeleur very soon loses her distinctive *Canadienne* personality, she is a clever and brilliant adventuress, and her career is logically drawn, from its obscure beginning to its despairing end. She is by no means typical, but she is possible. Claudia Estcourt, the contrasting figure, is typical, and though poetic justice may cry for the punishment of vanity, selfishness, and cruelty, a wide experience of life will commend the author's inflexibility. The novel is overladen with characters, and spun out, but it is carefully constructed, guided by taste and fine intention, and, moreover, it is interesting and enjoyable.

Such commendation cannot be given to 'Goblin Gold,' by May Crommelin; whose earlier novels promised a fair future. It is the threadbare story of a hypocrite who, attaching himself to a singularly ingenuous and generous man, drags him through a sequence of scrapes in order to oust him from his inheritance. This character is a survival. He is like the leering, hissing, hand-wringing villain still popular in melodrama, and unlike any human being that ever was.

His double appears in 'Primus in Indis.' The hero of this story is introduced burrahing and intriguing for Prince Charlie. The machinations of the villain prevent the hero's being more than a handsome and somewhat noisy supporter of the bonnie Prince; so, as a soldier of fortune, he follows Clive into India. Here the number of his adventures is more striking than their coherency, and, after they are told, Peterkin's interrogation, "What was it all about?" springs naturally to the lips.

The supernatural incidents in the 'Rabbi's Spell' are a concession to Mr. Cumberland's reputation as a wizard. The tale of murder and retribution could have been told as well without them. The real motive is to expose and censure Russian officialism, and, eliminating pages expressive of bitter personal hostility to Russia and the Russians, the motive is successfully realized through the action. Several scenes are skilfully managed, notably those between Count Soltikoff and his subordinate, Nevikoff. In these the author gives a lesson in the diplomatic art of making your desires understood without saying one word compromising to dignity or honor.

'King Solomon's Mines' is a capital boy's book, to which the purely fabulous foundation is no drawback. The marvellous adventures of Captain Good and his friends in the land that lay beyond the "Suliman Mountains" appeal, through devices familiar and novel, to the healthy boy's ardor for fighting savages and coming off victorious, with the spoils of Golconda to boot.

'Nuttie's Father,' by Miss Yonge, is not intended for children only; it may be read at any age with a perfect sense of security that moral bulwarks shall not be assailed. It has all the amiability and sincerity which have endeared Miss Yonge to two generations, but the girl who goes up for the Cambridge examinations is too abnormal a development for her to grapple with. It is very edifying to hear that Nuttie is going in for "higher education," but we can only feel that she has gone in heart and soul for mild dissipation, sanctified by convictions about the saving grace of the High Anglican ritual, and that the quadrilateral of the tennis ground represents to her consciousness the purest mathematical beauty.

Encouraged, probably, by the reception of her novel, Charlotte Dunning has gathered a few of her short stories together into a volume, which has been issued as one of the numbers of "Harper's Handy Series." It takes eleven tales to fill out the 200 pages, and, as a rule, they are quite short, airy, and light; yet they strike one as being more than sketches, after all. Whatever may be the facts in the case, one feels in reading them that they were not dashed off with recklessness: they seem to show the finishing marks of a careful hand. It is entirely to this finish of form and an engaging delicacy of style that the stories owe their charm, for there is nothing strikingly original, new, or distinctive about them; in fact, there is a flavor of other writers to be detected in one or two of them that is just slight enough to escape the appearance of imitation. "Told Between the Acts" recalls immediately a form in which Balzac liked to cast his sketches. The author's fondness for making a plot of the simplest materials and for turning the story on the very slightest incidents is noticeable throughout, and one finds one's self wondering, when the volume is put aside, what there was in it that interested him; but the interest is there, nevertheless.

The story of Margaret Kent is neither a new nor a pleasant one. It is told with a certain degree of facility, however, that gives it the air of a commonplace, clever piece of fiction-writing. There is no lack of incidents or situations, nor of characters not well enough drawn to be worthy of praise, nor yet poorly enough drawn to deserve unqualified censure. The novel, in a word, is commonplace throughout; it is not quite sensational, nor is it quite simple and natural. It has violent contrasts, a brisk movement, and excites an interest of a sort; but it is not an elevating or worthy interest. One is at a loss to see what Mrs. Kent finds in Dr. Walton to make her love him; and her faithfulness to her worthless husband, who returns from South America just as she is on the point of asking for a divorce, is rather too much forced upon her by circumstances for us to give her any great credit—for Dr. Walton's disgusted and almost brutally passionate attitude when he discovers that she is not a widow, as he had thought her, leaves her no alternative. The final complication, when Dr. Walton's mistake is reversed—when she is really a widow and he thinks it is not her husband but the latter's cousin who is dead—is a needless piling up of improbabilities. From the character of the book as a whole, however, one is inclined to think that the author has tolerably succeeded in what he set out to do, and one remembers that

"Not failure, but low aim is crime."

'Vergebens' is a pretty story, of the quiet or domestic order, which contrives to be interesting and to leave a pleasant impression in spite of its familiar plot and incidents and the melancholy character of many of the scenes. From its being written and printed in Chicago, the reader might suppose that it dealt with phases of German-American life, which would have given the work a unique interest; but this merit the author by no means claims. It deals, in fact, with life in a small South-German town fifty years ago; the characters, the author explains, being described partly from memory, but partly also from tradition. That, with scenes so distant and incidents which, though neither realistic nor commonplace, have long been common property with writers of fiction, the author should have been able to infuse vividness and vitality into her characters, argues considerable powers of sympathy and discernment.

LAUGHLIN'S BIMETALLISM.

The History of Bimetallism in the United States. By J. Laurence Laughlin, Assistant Professor of Political Economy in Harvard University. D. Appleton & Co. 1886.

It was very important that, with the beginning of the silver controversy as a live issue in politics, there should be put within easy reach a collection of all the stores needed for such a campaign. Nobody can have failed to notice how, since the assembling of Congress, this question has gone to the front, passing by easy stages the civil-service and the tariff and all other questions in its claims upon public attention. Yet it has been a momentous question ever since the 28th of February, 1878, when the Bland-Allison bill was passed over President Hayes's veto. Indeed, the controversy started two or three years earlier, as soon as the decline of silver below our old ratio of sixteen to one was recognized as a permanent change in the relative values of silver and gold. The public mind, however, appeared to take a rest after the passage of the silver-coinage law; and although nearly all instructed persons saw that great mischief was impending, and many used their best efforts to arouse public opinion to a sense of the coming danger, they were not able to gain attention. Now, however, the ball is opened. Masses of people are for the first time really taking sides. All the signs point to a protracted struggle, at the end of which most assuredly the silver men will be worsted, although they may prevent any action adverse to the Bland dollar in the present Congress. The conditions are such that the opponents of the arbitrary coinage of silver must continue to fight, however often they may be worsted, and must fight all the harder the oftener they are worsted. No such stress is imposed upon the other side. On the contrary, the larger the accumulation of Bland dollars in the Treasury, the less reason is there for continuing to coin.

Professor Laughlin's work is an extremely painstaking collection and methodical arrangement of all the facts needed by the student, the statesman, or the editor to fit him for taking part in this battle. Along with the collocation of material we have a clear and dispassionate argument, not of the controversial sort, maintaining the views held by nearly all economists of the present day on the subject of monetary standards. It is worth mention that prior to 1876, when the extraordinary decline in the price of silver began, the subject of bimetallism had not been much considered by English or American writers. The old discussions which antedated the adoption by England of the single gold standard were forgotten. So also were the debates of our own statesmen, in their gropings after the truth, which they eventually reached in practice in the year 1853, but did not embody in the law until 1873. In the former year it was found that true "metallism" consisted of a gold standard with a silver subsidiary coinage, the bullion value of the latter being sufficiently below the money value to prevent its being melted and exported and the country thus left without any small change. The settlement reached in 1853 was the acme of human wisdom simply because it was the embodiment of human experience carefully noted, and noted, too, by the evidence of no little suffering.

Professor Laughlin supplies us with the history of this long pursuit after truth in all its details. Nothing more instructive can be found in the history of any country. Indeed, all countries go through a like experience at one time or another. The laws of political economy are laws because

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they fit the whole world. The exceptions which are made so much of by the professorial socialists form interesting studies by themselves. It is vastly interesting to know why nations go to war and destroy life and property in such reckless fashion as we observe that they do, but it remains true that man's instinct is to save his life and his property, and that this instinct is so nearly universal that it may be resolved into a law. It will be interesting to know why the United States, after so much hard experience in learning the truth about the use of the two precious metals, abandoned it and adopted a practice utterly unknown and unexampled in the world's history—that of coining dollars on Government account. Monetary science is not concerned with this eccentricity. Political science is concerned with it by way of noting how a great people may follow an *ignus fatuus* into a Serbonian bog, and how they may toil back again after they have waded in it sufficiently. It is just as certain that the United States will come back to the single gold standard, with a silver subsidiary coinage, in law and in fact, as it was that all the nations of western Europe would come to that conclusion. The question now is whether we shall momentarily abandon the gold standard *de facto* before we turn our steps out of the bog.

As we have said, Professor Laughlin has grouped together all the scattered material of our own history, and nearly all that is useful from the history of other nations, to equip those who desire to enlist in the fight on the side of correct principles of finance. The arrangement of statistics regarding the production and coinage of gold and silver is especially valuable, presenting in graphic form the yield of the mines in each of the periods in the world's history marked by any unusual increase of one or the other metal, and also of the whole period from the discovery of America to the present time. It is not at all remarkable, but will be surprising to many readers, to observe how many of the otherwise inexplicable variations in the relative values of the two metals are accounted for by a glance at these charts, which are simply the setting forth of the law, or rather the facts, of supply. The other factor in the problem, the demand, is to be drawn from the history of commerce; and this, too, is supplied in due measure by the author. The two, taken together, make the law of supply and demand which governs the price of the one as measured by the other in all cases whatsoever. Incidentally, Professor Laughlin demolishes the most distinctive portion of the work of Mr. Dana Horton—that relating to the supposed disturbance of the equilibrium of the precious metals by the Bank of England's resumption in 1819—and gives the reader a strong impression of the superficiality of Mr. Horton's studies.

The only thing of importance that we miss from Professor Laughlin's volume is a chapter on the resumption of specie payments by Italy. This was a recent event of the first magnitude, pregnant with answers to many disputed questions of the sort which bimetallism has to do with. The appendices to the work are copious and well chosen. We wonder, however, why the table showing the coinage of the French mint stops at the year 1876. Surely they must have been doing something there the past nine years.

THE SHORTER PIECES OF FLAUBERT.

Œuvres Complètes de Gustave Flaubert. Tome vi. Trois Contes, suivis de Mélanges Inédits. Paris: A. Quantin; New York: Christern. 1885.

If it can be said of a reprint, we should say unhesitatingly that few more interesting books of literature have appeared last year, or will appear next year, than this latest and final volume of the eight volumes of Flaubert's works just issued by Quantin in his beautiful *ne varietur* edition. It is the only volume of the eight which could be put, by one who cares for Flaubert, into the hands of one who had not yet acquired a regard for him, with strong confidence that the general impression would be agreeable; and to those who value everything Flaubert has written, it is welcome as containing a considerable amount of material not heretofore published—though, as the new matter is mostly youthful work, its interest is chiefly biographical.

The volume opens with "Un Cœur Simple"—an extraordinarily vivid representation of the outer and inner life of a servant-woman, the servant of a widow in a small town. In force of imagination and power of expression this little tale could scarcely be surpassed. As a piece of writing it is very remarkable, and as a conception of a human existence its truth, spiritualized by its tenderness, and its tenderness invigorated by its truth, render it a masterpiece. It belongs to the same category as 'Les Reliques Vivantes' of Turgeneff, and to say that is to give it the highest praise.

The next tale is the legend of St. Julian Hospitaller, told with the utmost directness and simplicity, and with an astonishing *naturalness* of rendering, manifesting the supreme dramatic gift of living the life conceived. In Flaubert's case this gift has power to communicate itself singularly to the intelligence of the reader. Not only his own mind transmuted itself into that of the servant or the saint, feeling what they must have felt, seeing what they must have seen, senseless to all things not perceived by them, but we, too, see, feel, suffer, triumph, in their persons. This is largely an effect of *style*. Phrases, pages, in which every word rings true to the thought, stamp on the reader's mind so unusual a clearness and vividness of impression that one can scarcely distinguish it from a spontaneous act of the mind itself. The mingled conciseness and lingering of Flaubert's manner increase this intimacy of sympathy. When he is in the presence of what is familiar, he but glances at it and passes on, speaking only the necessary word to make it visible to us; when he encounters what is peculiar to the moment or the individual he pauses, watches, waits, gazes, intently listens, and, so gazing and listening, delivers those cadenced and magic utterances which create the universal out of the particular, the ideal out of the real, and art out of nature.

The third tale is the story of the death of John the Baptist (under his name of Iaokanann), considered as an incident in the accompanying historical movement. It is perhaps less successful than the other two, but the three together form a very perfect reflection of the three faces of Flaubert's mind—his observation of the present, his study of the past, and his leaning toward the supernatural; and their merit seems all the more apparent from the restriction of their compass.

These tales are followed by a preface (published in 1870) to a posthumous collection of the verses of Bouilhet, between whom and Flaubert existed the closest friendship—admirably expressed by this paper. Its quiet reserve gives great dignity to the feeling pulsating through it and vivifying it, and ennobles the outburst of emotion with which it closes. As if counselling two friends connected by such ties as had just been severed for himself—

"When one of them dies," he says, "let the other preciously cherish his memory as a rampart against all that is mean, as a succor in moments of weakness, or yet more like a household place of prayer where he will go to breathe out his sorrows and to ease his heart. How many times, at night, looking into the shadows behind that lamp which was wont to shine on both their brows, he will vaguely seek an indistinct form, almost questioning it, 'Should it be thus? Shall I so do? Tell me.' And if this remembrance is the eternal nourishment of his pain, it will be at least companionship in his loneliness."

We are obliged by honesty to confess that we have assumed a misprint in the text: the use there of the feminine form of the adjective in the clause "prête à l'interroger" would make the shade ("l'ombre") the questioner. But a similar misprint of "il" for "elle" on a subsequent page perhaps justifies us, and our rendering of the passage is borne out, in spirit at least, by the tone of Flaubert's letters during the months immediately following Bouilhet's death. "In losing my poor Bouilhet I have lost . . . one who saw my thought more clearly than I myself. His death has left for me a void of which I am every day more conscious." Again: "I feel no longer the need of writing, because I wrote especially for one sole being who exists no longer." He adds (it is to Mme. Sand): "You say to me things which are very beautiful, and very good too, trying to restore my courage. I scarcely have any, but I act as if I had, which perhaps comes to the same thing." For a long while—perhaps always—afterward it is evident, to use his own phrase (in 'Madame Bovary'), "il se sentit triste comme une maison démeublée."

In a letter written while composing the Preface, Flaubert says: "The difficulty is to know what not to say. I shall allow myself the relief of blurting out two or three dogmatic opinions on the art of writing; it will be an occasion to express what I think—a pleasure which I have always denied myself." These opinions are so inwoven with criticisms of his friend's work that they are not quotable, but they are well worth reading and considering. For the most part they are amplifications of the thought which La Bruyère declared in these terms: "Il faut exprimer le vrai pour écrire naturellement, fortement, délicatement."

Of the remaining half-volume, a hundred and fifty pages are occupied by hitherto unpublished sketches of a three months' walking tour in Brittany in 1847, when Flaubert was twenty-five years old, and ten pages by notes written on the Nile in 1850 (which appeared in *Le Gaulois* after his death). The Brittany sketches are eminently picturesque, and effective with touches of historical reminiscence, imaginatively treated, which produces an unusual and poetic mingling of past scenes with present ones. On one page is the funeral service of a poor fisherman, on another the bed of Diana of Poitiers, on another the "bagne" of Brest, and next the daring surprise of St. Malo in 1589—in "that prodigious sixteenth century . . . when the episode stands sharply out from the history, and yet holds its place in it in a marvellous fashion, brightening its colors and widening its horizons." He pictures brilliantly that period when, "even if we disregard the things visible at first glance, the beliefs cracking to their foundations like crumbling mountains, the new worlds discovered, the lost worlds unburied, Michael Angelo under his dome, Rabelais who laughs, and Shakspere who observes, and Montaigne who meditates—where shall we find elsewhere more development of passion, more violence of courage, more eagerness of will, and finally a more complete expansion of liberty, circling and beating up against all native fatalities?"

It was in these Brittany wanderings "par les champs et par les grèves" that Flaubert first drew the portrait of the beggar who ten years afterward was to be so conspicuous a figure in 'Madame Bovary.' Here, too, he came across an attempted assassination of two women, and gave them his services as a surgeon.

The Nile notes are less interesting, less simple,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less thoughtful, more personal; and, concerning themselves rather with souvenirs of French life than with records of Egyptian days, they are lacking in picturesqueness.

Flaubert's enthusiasm for the sixteenth century gives special interest to an essay on Rabelais among these "mélanges inédits." It is undated, but probably belongs to the author's early years. It is not only a criticism of Rabelais, but of the judgments passed on his work by the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries; thus setting forth its relation to its own age and the following ones with point and vigor. It is a careful study, but not an important one. One of the noteworthy thoughts in it is this: "Great writers are to the world of ideas what capitals are to kingdoms: they receive the influence of every province, of every individuality, and, mingling with this what is personal to themselves and original, they amalgamate it, they arrange it, giving it back transformed into art."

The remaining papers are valueless but powerful fragments from three of the many works Flaubert left in manuscript. Two of these three are dramatic rhapsodies on Death and Sin, Time and Eternity; but there is a list also of some dozen romances and tales, half-a-dozen historical essays, and several other more or less finished performances, all written from 1835 to 1843. It was not till 1857 that 'Madame Bovary' appeared, and though that cost him five years' work and he put an interval of six or seven years between that and each of his two next works, one is curious to know what, besides 'Madame Bovary,' occupied him in the fourteen years between the dates of the last manuscript and the first publication. The forthcoming volumes of his correspondence may perhaps inform us. The precocity of his talent, and at the same time its shrinking from publicity, were almost as striking as its force in maturity; it is evident that the passion for perfection of form, which was his life-long inspiration, moved him from the first. Such a passage as this is certainly remarkable for a youth of twenty years, and it must be remembered that it loses greatly by translation:

"I loved life, but life expansive, radiant, irradiating. I loved it in the wild gallop of horses, in the twinkling of the stars, in the movement of waves flowing toward the shore. I loved it in the throbbing of beautiful naked breasts, in trembling looks of love, in the vibration of the strings of a violin, in the rustling of oak trees, in the setting sun which gilds the windows and carries the thought to the balconies of Babylon, where queens leant and looked upon Asia."

This was his emotion at twenty, and at fifty *this* (in yet more untranslatable phrases):

"As for me, poor wretch, I am glued to the earth as if by leaden sandals; everything agitates me, lacerates me, destroys me, and I vainly strive to climb up higher."

"Sed quia semper aves quod abest, præsentia temnis,
Imperfecta tibi elapsaat ingrataque vita."

John de Witt, Grand Pensionary of Holland; or, Twenty Years of a Parliamentary Republic. By M. Antonin Lefèvre-Pontalis. Translated by S. E. and A. Stephenson. 2 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1885.

PIETER SIMONS'S work on the Grand Pensionary bears the title, 'Jan de Witt en zijn Tijd'; James Geddes's, 'History of the Administration of John de Witt,' etc.; M. Lefèvre-Pontalis shows by his sub-title still more distinctly that the theme is historical rather than biographical. And yet the Grand Pensionary is not the representative of a government or of a period, but the chief actor in a grand political drama—a leader, a combatant, and a victim. He is a man of surpassing intellect and ability, of indomitable energy and resolution, and of spotless civic virtue; and his end is as tragic as any recorded in history, modern or ancient. What induces his recent biographers to merge his life in his times is in part the scantiness of materials illustrating "the social, non-political, non-official side of him (the human side of him, in short"), as Mr. Geddes expresses it, and in part the ease with which the mountains of documents and correspondence left by him enable his biographers to connect almost every day of his public life with the doings and schemings of the leading statesmen, diplomats, and princes of his age. John de Witt loses in biography, as a striking individuality, by the constant association of his name with Cromwell, Charles II., Louis XIV., and the young William of Orange, whose antagonist he was successively, as well as with the rulers, princely or official, of Spain, Sweden, Denmark, Brandenburg, and the Empire, whose aid he managed to secure for the United Provinces. Besides, the Grand Pensionary was a mighty man of the pen only, and though he did not shrink from risking his life under the naval flag of his republic—when he thought it expedient to follow it as commissioner—his quiet achievements were eclipsed by the deeds of Tromp, of Ruyter, and even of his own brother, Cornelius. No page of the two volumes before us shows John de Witt in as heroic an attitude as that in which Cornelius appears at the side of Ruyter, in the naval battle of Solebay, very shortly before the day (in 1672) on which both brothers were to be torn to pieces by an infuriated mob of Orange men:

"The courage shown by Cornelius de Witt was no less worthy of admiration [than Ruyter's]. Ill, suffering from rheumatic pains in his arms and legs, but triumphing by the strength of his mind over bodily weakness, he took his place close to Ruyter near the helm. Incapable of standing, he had a chair brought to him bearing the arms of the republic, and sat there as if in the seat of government, to give the signal of command and to share at the post of honor the dangers of the crew. In order to represent with dignity the sovereignty of the States General, whose delegate he was, he was escorted by twelve guards carrying halberds; three fell wounded at his feet, three more were killed, and their bodies thrown into the sea. Careless of the balls that were falling round him, having already dedicated his life to the service of his country, he remained calm and immovable on the deck till the close of the day. . . ."

John was no less patriotic and no less firm, but, unfortunately for his stature in a Pantheon, his "diplomatic despatches alone, at three sous a sheet, had in twelve years been worth 4,900 florins to his principal clerk." He was also too economical in the service of the State as in his thrifty household—"the cost of copying . . . he had reduced from four to three sous a page"—too balanced and free from ostentation, too religiously domestic, to make a shining figure. His excellent wife, whom he lost early, and his children reflected in their plainness no lustre upon his home circle. The highest trait in the character of the family was their resignation, in which Roman and Christian fortitude appeared blended. Cornelius, tortured on the rack, shamed his judges into abandoning the false accusation of his having conspired against the Prince of Orange; and when the two brothers were soon after massacred, not only their sister, Johanna de Zwyndrecht, evinced a spirit undisturbed by fear and despair, but her firmness was surpassed by that of Cornelius's widow, Maria Hoeuft.

"The next day, as she was returning to Dordrecht, she met on the boat a passenger just come from the Hague. He had been a witness of the scene, and gave an account of it to the bystanders, winding up by exhibiting a finger which had been cut from Cornelius de Witt's hand.

"Maria, who had listened in silence, advanced towards him, and asked to look at the finger which he was showing. She examined it with reverent attention, and said suddenly, 'This finger was yesterday still on the hand of my beloved husband—I know it well.' At these words the passenger, who had not expected to find himself face to face with the victim's wife, fell down overwhelmed with emotion, and all who were with him on the boat were struck with pity, whilst Maria remained calm and collected in her sorrow."

It should not be inferred from our extracts that the history before us abounds in striking delineations of scenes, situations, and character. Far from it: it is a diplomatic history, full of lengthy and occasionally tedious, though always instructive, accounts of negotiations, debates, and changing political phases, and often overladen with details more apt to obscure than to amplify the narrative—a defect which the work shares with too many historical productions of our time. On the other hand, the French historian of De Witt is fortunately free from his English contemporary's, Geddes's, excessive "lack of enthusiasm for his subject, and the coldness, both of his judgment and diction," which we have had occasion to remark upon before (*Nation*, No 837). M. Lefèvre-Pontalis would never have said, like him, "The period . . . is not an heroic period, and John de Witt is in no sense a hero"; nor, in summing up the main activity of the Grand Pensionary—in opposing the centralization of Dutch power in the hands of an Orange stadtholder—"This surely was poor work, even taking it at its best." He sees in him a statesman who not only faithfully served his country and liberty, but who secured the former a place in the highest rank of European policy, and firmly established the latter—"a man of worth greater than any mere statesmanship, and character higher even than his talents." His work was good, and did not perish with him.

"The ineffaceable traces left by the long ministry of John de Witt were useful in keeping up the fidelity of this attachment to tutelary institutions. The power which he had exercised for twenty years bore without detriment the supreme test by which a good government is recognized, which even after downfall seems to live again in the benefits it confers. Before the United Provinces, threatened with the loss of their independence, had appealed to the Prince of Orange to save them, the Grand Pensionary of Holland had placed them out of the reach of the usurpations of a despotic power by accustoming them to rule themselves."

The Lives of Robert and Mary Moffat. By their son, John S. Moffat. With an introduction by William M. Taylor, D.D. With portraits and maps. A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1885. Pp. xix, 484, 8vo.

AMONG the persons sent out by the London Missionary Society to South Africa in the year 1816 was a young Scotch gardener named Moffat. The son of a customs officer in humble circumstances, he was early accustomed to severe toil and privations. The want of a regular education was of little moment, as from a boy "he had a craving, which clung to him through life, to learn something of whatever he came in contact with." After a short delay, the lad (he was but just twenty-one when he landed) was sent to the kraal of the noted outlaw chief Afrikaner, who had for many years been a terror to the colonists, but had now consented to receive a missionary. During the year spent at this station Moffat gained an extraordinary influence over the natives, as well as the strong personal attachment of the chief. This was owing in part to his noble presence, his singularly winning face and manner, but more to the perfectly fearless confidence and honesty with which he treated them. The Government was not slow to recognize this influence, especially after seeing the change wrought upon Afrikaner, whom Moffat had persuaded to accompany him to the Cape, and "imperious" proposals were made to him to become Government missionary to the Kaffirs. This invitation was declined in order that he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might continue the work he had begun among the Bechwanas.

In 1819 he was married to Mary Smith, a daughter of a former employer, and a person admirably fitted to be his companion. Her courage was proof against every danger. Her faith was unfaltering, and her devotion to the missionary work equal to his own. They made their home on the banks of the Kuruman, nearly four hundred miles beyond the then border of the colony, and in a few years, under their fostering care, the desert began literally to "blossom like the rose." The civilizing influence of neat houses, and gardens filled with fruit trees, upon the natives, however, was long unattended by corresponding religious results. The brutish savages, untouched by the devotion of their teachers, seemed deaf to their appeals, and for ten years they labored without a convert. Nevertheless, their confidence in the truth of their Gospel message never wavered. At a time when there was "no glimmer of the dawn," a letter was received from a friend in England "asking if there was anything of use which could be sent." The answer of Mary Moffat was, "Send us a communion service; we shall want it some day." It came three years later, the day before the first converts were baptized. About this time Moffat undertook to provide a literature for his flock, and after thirty years of frequently interrupted labor, he had translated and printed the Bible and several other books in the Bechwana language. He made, also, numerous journeys both to the coast and into the interior, to gain the confidence of the natives, to secure openings for missionary work, to mediate between hostile tribes, and to prevent raids upon the white settlements. These journeys were never unattended by dangers, and were often exceedingly tedious. Twice Mary Moffat was detained more than a month on the banks of the Orange and Vaal Rivers, waiting for the waters to subside sufficiently to permit wagons to cross. Lions were very numerous and bold, besieging the travellers at times and destroying their oxen, while during the journeys into the interior the peril from bands of marauding savages was never absent. It was a trying life, in which the frequent and long separations of husband and wife, and parents and children, were the hardest to bear.

In 1839 a much-needed rest was taken in a visit to England, during which time the New Testament was printed, and Moffat, besides continuing his work of translation and delivering numerous missionary addresses, wrote his 'Labors and Scenes in South Africa.' After four years spent in this manner they returned to their station and were met on the banks of the Vaal by David Livingstone, who "had ridden from Kuruman, a distance of a hundred and fifty miles, to bid them welcome." The references to their future son-in-law are comparatively few, but they are sufficient to show that while the attachment between him and the Moffats was very deep, his giving up the missionary work for that of an explorer was a grief and disappointment to them. Livingstone, on his part, shared in this feeling to such an extent that he supported a missionary, to be his deputy, as it were, out of his own private resources, devoting "more than a fourth of his Government salary to this object." The old life, with its multitude of pursuits, was taken up again. Gordon Cumming, the famous hunter, who passed through Kuruman on his way to the interior, says of Moffat: "Minister, gardener, blacksmith, gunsmith, mason, carpenter, glazier, every hour of the day finds this worthy pastor engaged in some useful employment." The most interesting episode of this part of his life was his third and last visit to the noted chief Mosilikatse, who had conceived an extraordinary affection for him. When he reached the chief's house, Moffat says, "I entered; he grasped my hand, gave one earnest look, and drew his mantle over his face. It would have been an awful sight for his people to see the hero of a hundred fights wipe from his eyes the falling tears. He spoke not, except to pronounce my name, Moshete, again and again. He looked at me again, his hand still holding mine, and he again covered his face."

In 1870, having completed a half century of work in the missionary field, the aged pair returned to England, Mary Moffat to die shortly after she landed, Robert Moffat to receive public honors such as probably no missionary in our time has ever received. The Queen twice sought an interview with him. The University of Edinburgh conferred the degree of D.D., the Corporation of London the freedom of the city upon him. Dean Stanley invited him, a Wesleyan, to speak in Westminster Abbey. The Lord Mayor of London gave him a public breakfast at which the Archbishop of Canterbury made the principal speech. And yet he had done no great work, had made no important discoveries, but had simply devoted his life to the welfare of an obscure tribe of savages. It was the missionary, not the man, whom his countrymen delighted to honor. He died in 1883, in the eighty-eighth year of his age.

The editor of this deeply-interesting biography, the son and successor of Dr. Moffat in his missionary work, has done his part well, though he has passed too briefly over the earlier part of his father's life, under the mistaken impression that his readers would be familiar with it from Dr. Moffat's own account. The burning questions of Cape politics are barely touched upon, but enough is said to show that Dr. Moffat was most strongly opposed to the giving back of the Transvaal to the Boers, and also to the Zulu war. The numerous letters which the editor gives show both his parents to have possessed, in addition to very earnest piety, considerable powers of description as well as a vein of strong common sense. Some of the expressions in them strike us as very felicitous, as, for instance, in speaking of his frequent interruptions, Dr. Moffat says, they "dart on one with the uncertainty of a shooting star, and render the appropriation of time as devious as the flight of the bat." The two maps of South Africa in 1820 and 1884 are very meagre, many of the places referred to in the narrative being left out. It is often difficult on this account to trace Dr. Moffat's journeys into the interior.

New India; or, India in Transition. By H. Y. S. Cotton, Bengal Civil Service. London: Kegan Paul & Co. 1885.

THIS little book is an earnest and well-reasoned plea for the concession of a large measure of political liberty to the people of India; and the argument derives additional weight from the fact that Mr. Cotton is a member of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy which at present rules over India with virtually irresponsible power. The need for some change must be very urgent, indeed, when a member of the Bengal civil service does not shrink from pressing upon his countrymen the propriety of such radical alterations in the established order of things as are recommended in 'New India.' Of the profound importance of the subject discussed by Mr. Cotton there cannot be two opinions. The problem in process of solution is whether or not it is possible to graft upon Oriental minds the practical capacities of the West, and upon the immobility of Oriental institutions the progressive and adaptive attributes of European civilization. Should this problem be worked out successfully, then there can be little doubt that the new life breathed into the people of India will gradually extend itself over the entire continent. If, on the contrary, the experiment fails here, "the light of Asia" will be, as it were, extinguished.

The great delicacy and difficulty of the existing situation are due to the fact that it is a product of two antagonistic influences which have been operating in British India for the better part of a century. As a result of one of these influences, the British Administration has become more centralized and despotic than before, and, consequently, a great deal less susceptible to the currents of native thought and feeling. As a result of the other, the most energetic, able, and aspiring portion of the people have become inspired with ideas and opinions which cause them to feel an alien despotism as a grievous injustice and an almost intolerable burden. In the earlier days of the East India Company, British power in India was the newly sprung authority of one band of adventurers among many. When Hyder Alee ruled in Seringapatam and the Mahratta Peshwas at Poonah, the struggle for empire was still a doubtful one. Indeed, but for the alliance of other native States, it is not improbable that the company of English merchants might have succumbed to the forces arrayed against it. Such a relationship between the two races had the effect of bringing Englishmen and Indians together upon a footing more nearly approaching equality than has been possible since the former became the one unquestioned and paramount Power throughout the Continent. Then, again, the effect of British rule has been to destroy the ancient aristocracy, and to grind down all classes to one dead level of helplessness and poverty. This levelling down of society consigned the two or three English officers in each district to an almost unbroken solitude, so far as the body of the people was concerned. They were brought into direct contact with the criminal classes, and they maintained of necessity certain formal relations with their own native subordinates; but they lived cut off from all that knowledge of the people and the country which is obtainable only in the free and equal intercourse of private life. It was this long-continued isolation which gave rise to those grotesque conceptions of native character which are prevalent among Englishmen in India, and which have received literary expression in the description of the Bengalese to be found in Lord Macaulay's essay on Warren Hastings. They ascribed to the people in general the same characteristics which most impressed them in the two classes of which alone they had any direct experience. Because the petty native officials, liable to dismissal and ruin at any moment from the caprice or ill-temper of their English superiors, endeavored to secure their position by sycophancy and obsequiousness, therefore manliness and independence of spirit were qualities not to be found anywhere in India. Because the complicated procedure of English law courts fostered a vast amount of perjury in those who had to appear before them, therefore *all* natives, in all relations of life, were wholly actuated by a spirit of lying, treachery, and deceit. These opinions, loudly and repeatedly expressed, had the natural effect of compelling sensitive and self-respecting natives to hold aloof from the society of their English rulers. They could not, in truth, venture into it except at the risk of being grievously insulted. And though few sensible Englishmen, at the present time, continue to speak or to think in this outrageous way, the gulf which was then dug between the two races is still very far from being filled up.

"The really best men," Mr. Cotton says, "among the natives of India who influence opinion and lead society, . . . do not care to make the acquaintance of Government officials

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if they can help it, and they do not thrust themselves on the Government. . . . Englishmen hear little of them, and the Government, as a rule, knows them not, but their names are household words among the homes of the people."

These leaders of the people are at present a rapidly increasing class, owing to the spread of English education. No one at all acquainted with the Indians can doubt the activity and acuteness of their minds; and when Western knowledge was placed within their reach, they devoted themselves to its acquisition with a passionate eagerness. But, as Mr. Cotton has acutely pointed out, this Western knowledge did a great deal more for the people of India than inspiring their leading spirits with new political ideas and methods of language. It provided them with a common language, and, in so doing, removed the great impediment which checked the growth of a national feeling:

"No other bond of unity was possible; the confusion of tongues was an insuperable obstacle. But now the English language is established as the channel through which the fire worshippers of Bombay and the Baboos of Bengal, the Brahmins of Madras and the Mahrattas of Poona, the Pathans and Rajpoots of Upper India, and the Tamil and Telugu-speaking races of the other extreme end of the peninsula, are able to meet on one common platform, and to give expression to their common interests and aspirations. . . . A quarter of a century ago there was no trace of this; the idea of any Bengalee influence in the Punjab would have been a conception incredible to Lord Lawrence. Yet it is the case that during the past year the tour of a Bengalee lecturer, lecturing in English, assumed the character of a triumphal progress; and at the present moment the name of Surendro Nath Banerjea excites as much enthusiasm among the rising generation of Moultan as in Dacca."

Here, then, are the two antagonists who must be induced to work together in harmony if the structure of British power in India is not to be shattered by internal revolution. On the one side there is a ruling caste of foreigners who have hitherto enjoyed a monopoly of place and power, and a complete immunity from criticism; on the other, a yearly increasing proportion of the subject people whose intellect, ambition, and independence of spirit have been trained, educated, and equipped with appropriate weapons by the ruling caste itself. By the educated natives themselves there is nothing more earnestly deprecated than a violent solution of this difficulty; and so long as they retain their ascendancy over their countrymen, internal peace and order are secure. But unless the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy is prepared to surrender a portion of its power, there must come a time when this ascendancy will be snatched from them to pass into the possession of more daring and adventurous spirits. And so far, all the indications show that nothing short of compulsion will persuade the bureaucracy to yield one jot or one tittle of its authority. Again and again, in royal proclamation and Parliamentary resolution, has the principle been affirmed that the service of the state in India is to be thrown open to all British subjects, without regard to their race, color, or religion; but they are uttered to deaf ears so far as the ruling bureaucracy is concerned. The pledges thus solemnly given to the people of India remain unredeemed to this day, and will remain so forever, until some force is applied to the English in India which they are unable to resist. If the nation at home fails to apply that pressure there, it will certainly, sooner or later, be applied after a very destructive fashion by the people of India.

Mr. Cotton urges upon his countrymen to be wise in time. They profess to have been educating the people of India for the duties and responsibilities of self-government. The period of education he considers to be now past, and the time to have arrived for fulfilling, at any rate in part, the hopes and the promises which have been held out to them. The future of India, he is of opinion, will be a federation of independent States cemented together by the power of England; and it is toward that issue that English effort in India should be directed:

"Years must elapse, generations may pass away, before we can expect the consummation of the policy I advocate. But it is a policy which we should always keep before our eyes, to which all our efforts should converge. Sooner or later India must again take her old rank among the nations of the East, and all our action should be devoted to facilitating her progress to freedom. Not in mere vague talk, but strenuously and of set purpose, it should be the principal object of our Indian Government to address itself to the peaceful liquidation of its concerns, and the reconstruction of native administrations in its own place."

Traité d'Épigraphie Grecque. Par Salomon Reinach. Paris: E. Leroux. 1885.

THE last few years have been marked by an increased attention to epigraphy. Of the importance of epigraphic studies there has never been any question among scholars, but the interest has been much heightened of late years, so that the caution which Dr. Jowett expressed in his 'Thucydides,' that "in any sound study of ancient Greek inscriptions we must be prepared for slender results," grated harshly on a large class of enthusiasts. This increased interest is due to increased exploration. Without exploration there can be no deep professional interest, no contagious enthusiasm. The palæographer and the textual critic need not be one, but without palæographic vision the textual critic is sure to flounder. So the multiplication of explorers has greatly increased the number and zeal of the students of epigraphy. The inspection of the monuments themselves gives a sense of immediateness that nothing else can give. It is one thing to read in Grote of the famous inscription which commemorates the citizens of "the Erechtheid tribe who were slain in one and the same year in Cyprus, Egypt, Phœnicia, the Halieis, Ægina, and Megara"; another thing to be brought face to face with the stone itself in a corner of the Louvre. But wholly apart from this intangible and imponderable element, the value of inscriptions has never been so much appreciated as it is to-day for the fruitful study of morphology and phonology; and the testimony of the stones is the most important testimony we can have as to the life of the classic languages, especially of Greek. And though it must be confessed that it is hard to read anything into or out of many inscriptions, the most insignificant fragment may contain a most momentous fact for the student of dialect, of lexiology. Ephebic inscriptions are not exhilarating: the lesson they convey is soon learned, and the official style of Egyptian Greek soon ceases to amuse; but, as if to reward the zeal of the modern epigraphist, new treasures are always turning up, as, for instance, the great find at Gortyn in Crete, which is fresh in the memory of our readers, and which is as full of interest for the student of law as for the student of Greek life and language. Americans have not been content to be passive recipients of European learning and research in this province, and no book on Greek epigraphics is complete without a reference to the work of the Assos expedition, to the explorations of Doctor Sterrett, to the interpretations of Professor Merriam and Professor Allen.

Once, in order to get a notion of Greek inscriptions, it was necessary to handle the ponderous tomes of Boeckh's monumental work, and it is still true that no compendium can ever take the place of the publications of the Berlin Academy. All students—yes, even beginners—should be encouraged to make themselves personally acquainted with the great folios of erudition as well as with the manifold handy books that meet the immediate need. And yet manuals are necessary for daily use, and Cauer and Dittenberger and Kaibel and Roehl and Hicks and Collitz and his associates have made admirable collections from different points of view. Of books for reading, for practice, there is no immediate lack. What M. Reinach has undertaken to supply in the present volume is a work that shall replace the 'Elementa' of Franz—an admirable treatise, which unfortunately has become rare, and which in the advance of epigraphic knowledge and of epigraphic appliances has also become in a measure antiquated, though it is much to be doubted whether a good book ever becomes really obsolete. M. Reinach tells us that the famous epigraphists of Europe have declined the task; they have not dared put to the touch "the reputation slowly acquired by monographs that have been more praised than perused." And so he has come to the rescue. As he well says, a man who published a Manual of Classical Philology at twenty-one cannot plead modesty at twenty-seven, and so we have the 'Traité d'Épigraphie Grecque'—not only a work of astounding industry of the bibliographical sort (M. Reinach has prepared us for being astounded), but a book full of life and freshness. We are not always ferreting among dusty periodicals and forgotten magazines; we are not always straining our eyes over faint photographs and unsatisfactory squeezes. We are in the free air, climbing ruins, wading mill-races, liberating the fine old stone from a coat of envious plaster, or cajoling some secretive Greek or speculative Turk to guide us to the hiding-place of some epigraphic beauty. M. Reinach, to be sure, does not go into the details that make Schliemann's narrative so quaintly personal, but we feel everywhere that we are favored with the bright presence of a man who has lived what he writes.

After a fairly long introduction, in which he gives an account of the *raison d'être* and plan of the book and a general letter of instructions to the beginner in epigraphic exploration and study, M. Reinach presents us in two chapters with a translation of Mr. Newton's admirable Essay on Greek Inscriptions, accompanied with many notes of his own, which bring the bibliography down to the most recent times. Then follows M. Reinach's own special contribution, entitled "Traité des Inscriptions et des Formules," in five chapters, comprising the history of the Greek alphabet, the orthography and grammar of the inscriptions, inscriptions in general, public acts, miscellaneous and private inscriptions, a chapter of miscellanies on eras, names, and the like, with addenda and corrigenda, in which the latest numbers of European and American journals are diligently used.

This is not the place for detailed criticism of a work which, by its very nature, presents numberless points on which malignity might fasten. How is it possible that a false date, a false reference should not have crept in, that some Dryasdust memoir should not have been overlooked? It is a book for which all those who need guidance will be duly grateful, and not least for the sharp tone in which the author summons the goodly fellowship of epigraphists to the manifest though painful duty of appending translations to the inscriptions which they publish. The omission of such translations, he says, "is a very bad habit, which leads many people to publish what they do not understand, and to dwell in their commentaries only on those passages which they can make out. Nothing is omitted except the difficulties, and as these are passed over adroitly in silence, the kind reader who does not understand imagines either that he is very ignorant or that the editor is more erudite than himself." It is the old evil of school editions of the classics transplanted

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to a higher sphere, and M. Reinach does well to expose it.

Institutes of Logic. By John Veitch, LL.D., Professor of Logic and Rhetoric in the University of Glasgow. Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1885. 8vo, pp. 551.

THE first question that a man should ask himself when he thinks of writing a book on logic is, Have I thoroughly comprehended my Mill? Whoever does not know that Mill has done more than any other writer since Aristotle to rescue logic from the charge of being too useless and too puerile to deserve the name of science, can hardly hope to write a book that shall be worth the writing. Whoever thinks that what Mill has had to say on most of the subjects of logical discussion is both foolish and unimportant, will have to contend against a pretty strong presumption in the mind of his readers that a great part of his own book will turn out to be unimportant and foolish, if nothing worse.

Mr. Veitch presents a mind of curious quality: the psychologists would find it an interesting study. It is remarkable that the same man should be able to point out the secret of Hegel's contradictions so clearly as he has done, and to make, himself, so many plain and simple errors. He says: "What appears to sense may be affirmed as a sensible fact and denied as a transcendental or supersensible fact. . . . Vacillation in regard to the sphere of the affirmation and negation is at the root of most of the current Hegelian fallacies. Their apparent profundity is only lack of transparency." This is admirably stated. Mr. Veitch's contributions to logic are not equally forcible.

Most people will think twice before they allow themselves to suppose that they have discovered a new form of syllogism; the antecedent probability of accomplishing that feat is about as great as that of pointing out a hitherto unnoticed sun in the heavens. Mr. Veitch offers this (in the negative form) as his discovery—he has named it the Syllogism of Collection: "The crops this season are not good in quality, the crops this season are not good in quantity; therefore the crops this season are not good in either quality or quantity." "This," he says, "is a perfectly simple form of reasoning in common use, though not fitting into any of the received formulæ—nay, in the negative form even apparently violating the rule against two negative premises." After this, one is anxious to know what Mr. Veitch supposes syllogism to be. This is the way he gives his definition: "It is that I have two propositions—not one merely, as in the case of immediate inference—and out of these two I not only get, but I am obliged to get, a third." In this he puts in an unessential feature of syllogism and leaves out an essential one. No one is obliged to draw any conclusion at all from two premises. It may not occur to him to see what can be said without reference to the middle term. If any one asks him the question, or if it enters his mind of its own accord, the conclusion, it is true, is forced upon him, but no more so than in immediate inference. Can any one refrain from admitting that if the moon is not made of cheese, it is, all the more, not made of green cheese, if the idea has once entered his head? The essence of syllogism—what Mr. Veitch has omitted to notice—lies in the fact that it accomplishes the elimination of a term common to the two premises, and enables one, by dropping half the information which the premises together contained, to preserve the remaining half in a form convenient for use. What Mr. Veitch calls a new syllogism, logicians consider to be a grammatical device for saying in one sentence what might be said in two.

Mr. Veitch shows as little skill in dealing with the theory as with the form of syllogism. He fails to see the *petitio principii* which every syllogistic argument contains. He says, "May I not know that all mineral acids are poisons without knowing that salt is a mineral acid?" Certainly you cannot, is the easy reply. Suppose salt turns out to be a mineral acid and not to be a poison: what becomes of your too hasty generalization then? It is not without the aid of some misrepresentation that he finds Mill so often "ludicrous" and "ridiculous." Mill shows that the conclusion gives nothing that is not given in the two premises. Veitch says (p. 377) that it is absurd of Mill to think that the conclusion gives nothing that is not given in *one* premise.

Any one who can devote eighty weary pages to moods and figures, and forty to the quantification of the predicate, will not be expected to have much that is luminous to say on the difficult subject of induction. To Mr. Veitch it appears that the canons exert a weak and unsteady influence compared with formal logic, that they cannot for a moment be placed on the same high level with the laws of thought. That may be true, but the fact remains that children seldom make mistakes in syllogism, and that the wisest may be grateful for any real guidance in the art of making general propositions. Induction, Mr. Veitch thinks, is but a poor process, necessarily imperfect, and Mr. Jevons, he says, has amply endorsed this view. It is no doubt a great pity that the Creator of the universe did not send down a copy of its laws ready made. We should have been spared an endless amount of trouble, and we should never have been plunged into that deep gulf of uncertainty from which we have now no hope of escape. As it is, however, perhaps our wisest plan is to make our poor little craft as seaworthy as possible, and not to waste our time in sighing for other worlds than the world in which our unhappy lot is cast.

An Atlas of Practical Elementary Biology. 4to, 24 plates, with explanatory text. With a preface by Professor Huxley, P.R.S. Macmillan. 1885.

LIKE McAlpine's 'Biological Atlas,' this work has special reference to Huxley and Martin's 'Elementary Biology,' the usefulness of which, as frankly admitted by Professor Huxley in his preface, has been greatly interfered with by the absence of illustrations. The twenty-four plates represent the principal features of the anatomy, histology, and development of the frog, crayfish, earthworm, snail, mussel, hydra, unicellular organisms (vorticella, amœba, protococcus, yeast plant, and bacterioid), fungi, stoneworts, fern, and several flowering plants. As compared with McAlpine, the figures are more elaborate, more numerous—somewhat crowded, indeed, on certain plates—and, upon the whole, more accurate, though not free from error. They are not so readily understood by the student, because uncolored and less distinct in outline, and because the parts are designated by abbreviations instead of the entire names, and the explanatory text does not face the plates. The directions and descriptions are more extended, and there is a very complete bibliography of manuals and original papers upon the forms treated of.

In connection with works like the present, there arise three questions, here stated in an order inversely to that of their comprehensiveness: What "forms of life" should be selected for elementary study? In what order should they be taken up? At what stage ought such instruction to be given? Conceding that the vertebrates are to have but a single representative, it should probably be an amphibian; but the structure of the frog is so exceptional in many respects, that it is to be hoped that efforts may be made to introduce into biology-studying countries the more generalized Necturus of North America. Theoretically, the lowest forms should be considered first, and perhaps they might be practically if the Amœba and yeast plant were large and easily handled. Again: since, upon the whole, vegetable organisms are lower than animal, plants might be taken up first. But, finally, a vertebrate with limbs and distinct head is readily comparable with the human body, and is therefore easier to begin with. It is to be noted that the 'Elementary Biology' and 'McAlpine' begin with the unicellular organisms and end with the frog, while the present work, presumably with the approval of Huxley himself, presents the forms in the order given in the early part of this notice.

At present—in this country, at least—work like that implied in this atlas is only provided for in colleges. But the college professor, even when his chair is nominally that of "Biology," is almost inevitably a botanist or a zoölogist. If a practical knowledge of organic types could be gained in the schools—and without encouraging the student to regard himself as a "biologist" on that account—it would be an advantage in several directions which cannot be particularized here.

Songs from the Novelists, from Elizabeth to Victoria. Edited, with an introduction and notes, by William Davenport Adams. London: Ward & Downey; New York: Scribner & Welford. 1885.

MR. DAVENPORT ADAMS has prepared as interesting an anthology as we have seen for several years. He acknowledges in his introduction that his work was suggested by Bell's well-known collection of 'Songs from the Dramatists.' This stopped with Sheridan, although there are not a few songs of the later dramatists which deserve inclusion—the "Wearing of the Green" from Mr. Boucicault's 'Arrah-na-Pogue,' for instance, and "If my Glances have Betrayed Me," from Robertson's 'Ours.' Mr. Adams, beginning quite as far back as Bell, has brought his collection down to date—at least he has thought best to extract and preserve certain alleged songs by certain of the distinctly third-rate British story-makers of our own time. But in general his choice has been as commendable as his research has been wide. He begins with Sir Philip Sidney, Robert Greene, and Thomas Lodge. Then he moves along to Fielding, Richardson, Smollett, and Goldsmith. Scott brings us into the present century, where the name of the novelist is Legion and the songs of the novelists are abundant. It is not a little surprising, even to one whose business it is to be well read in English fiction, to see how many familiar songs are embedded in equally familiar tales. Goldsmith's "Elegy on a Mad Dog" and "When Lovely Woman Stoops to Folly" are both in the 'Vicar of Wakefield,' "Gaffar Gray" is in the 'Hugh Trevor' of the revolutionary Thomas Holcroft; Lover's "Widow Machree" and Lever's "Widow Malone" are both to be found first in their Irish stories; in a novel Lever put his version of the "Pope of Rome," another version of which was made by Thackeray, and in a novel Thackeray put his "Ho, pretty page with dimpled chin"; "A place in the memory, dearest," is said or sung in Gerald Griffin's 'Collegians,' from which Mr. Boucicault was to borrow the 'Colleen Bawn,' without even changing the names of the characters; and "O, Mary, go and call the cattle home," made its first appearance in Charles Kingsley's 'Alton Locke.' Omissions there are not a few, for in declaring the text of an anthology like this every man may make his own canon. For example, we may ask in vain for the jolly song in Mr. Walter Besant's 'Readymoney Mortiboy,' or for the tender lyric in his later historical novel,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'Dorothy Forster'; and we may wonder at the omission of the pretty verses in 'Their Wedding Journey.'

The songs are arranged in what seems to be a sort of irregular chronological sequence—by the death dates of the authors—and so not altogether happily. There is a detailed table of contents and a final table of first lines; there are excerpts from the novels to explain the circumstances of the story in which they were supposed to be sung, and these appear as foot-notes; and in an appendix there are such other and more ample explanatory notes as were called for.

Madame Mohl. Her Salon and her Friends. A Study of Social Life in Paris. By Kathleen O'Meara. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1886.

To say that this is an extremely interesting book would be faint praise. Perhaps no one has an easier task, in entertaining the reader, than the author who writes of people who spent their lives in making life socially agreeable in a brilliant sphere; and, indeed, one must be very ill-furnished with taste and discretion to make any account of the famous salons stupid. In the case of Mme. Mohl, there is a good deal to give special character to the old story of the evenings of the conversationalists. In particular, she was an English woman, and the eccentricity of the race was markedly developed in her. She was, in fact, a character, and the frankness of her expression gave full effect to her peculiarities. It was not merely in her dress, which seems to have been frightful, nor her deportment, which was often surprising, but in her qualities, that her originality was most pronounced. The secret of the attraction which gathered about her for so many years the intellectual society that was at Paris, either permanently or temporarily, is not easily discovered; and those who submitted to the charm gave the most diverse accounts of its power. It is not unlikely that from the time when she alone could chase the *ennui* from Chateaubriand's old age, to that when the venerable Thiers confessed to her that he was her too timid lover in his student days, the fascination passed through many changes; yet the testimony is strong that it never failed. She had prejudices, as was proper to her island extraction, and these led her into the most inexcusable rudenesses, as in her notorious insult to Ristori, though this was unpremeditated; but she does not seem to have had ideas, nor are any witty sayings of hers remembered. In herself she was very variously compounded, and not a few disagreeable traits entered into her personality: clearly she was mistress of the art of displeasing. In the midst of the piquant anecdotes and situations which enliven the volume, one finds that his sense of comedy is not infrequently appealed to—not ungraciously, but greatly to the damage of Mme. Mohl's dignity. In spite of all faults, she maintained her empire; and her affections, which were quick, strong, and faithful, bound to her some of the most distinguished of her contemporaries. She would not have been the Englishwoman without this strength of heart in conjunction with her force and oddities of character. Her old age is presented as singularly devoid of charm. Generally speaking, the lines of the portrait are drawn too much from her later years; but it is extraordinarily lifelike, and a valuable addition to the salon gallery.

What We Really Know about Shakespeare. By Mrs. Caroline Healey Dall. Boston: Roberts Bros.

THIS tasteful volume is issued as a popular handbook of the results of scholarly research into the facts of Shakspere's life. One-half of it is occupied by an "outline biography," made up of the documentary evidence in regard to the Shaksperes' station in life, business transactions, and family affairs, in which the only novelty one remarks is the certainty with which the author "feels" that Shakspere was on the Continent from 1587 to 1592. The rest of the volume is filled with a bundle, rather than an arrangement, of abstracts, notes, tables, quotations, etc., which involve some repetition. The entire book contains, in one place or another, mention of about every document or contemporary reference having relation to the poet, and a large part of the references to him in the literature of the next century; and is a sort of digest of the special scholar's volumes of Halliwell-Phillipps and of Ingleby's 'Centurie of Prayse,' to which Mrs. Dall makes no secret of her indebtedness. With regard to this she says in her prefatory declaration: "As my outline pretends to little originality, I have not paused to use quotation marks, even when I use the very words of better authorities." The book is really aimed at the "Baconians," and is meant to show that Shakspere was a man of substance, position, and character, incapable of such a part as is assigned him by the adherents of Bacon. But those who are blind enough to be "Baconians" are deaf to argument, and lack indeed no deficiency except the sole one that would grace them—to be dumb. This publication is really serviceable as a book of reference, a kind of encyclopædia of the facts of Shakspere's life, so strangely heterogeneous and disconnected.

Rocky Mountain Botany. Manual of the Botany of the Rocky Mountain Region, from New Mexico to the British Boundary. By John M. Coulter, Ph.D., Professor of Botany in Wabash College, and Editor of the *Botanical Gazette.* Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor & Co. 1885.

THIS is an offset, as it were, of Gray's 'Manual,' planted in the virgin soil of the Western Plains and the Rocky Mountains. It was much wanted and is to be of great use—first, to the botanists of this newly settled but now populous region, and to the many tourists who visit the mountains in summer; next, to the schools and colleges which are springing up in all the principal places. All these scattered folk are like sheep without a botanical shepherd when they get beyond the range of Gray's 'Manual,' and so it is needful and most fitting that they should have a manual of their own. This which is now provided for them will be all the more natural and convenient for being conducted, as it is, on the lines of the familiar model, both in substance and in typography. And we note one decided improvement, in that—the flora of the region being still so largely in the state of nature, and the introduced weeds few—the author has kept the intruders out of the body of his fair pages, relegating them to foot-notes. We wonder there are so few of them; indeed, we suspect that their presence has in a degree been ignored. But the unwelcome foreigners are coming nevertheless; and by the time the second edition is called for, like the "tall buttercups" which an English poetess sings, "they will be seen, whether we will or nay." Still, as long as we can have a flora of pure native Americans, let us enjoy it.

The present work, which, so far as we can judge, seems very well done, comes naturally from Professor Coulter. He was the author, conjointly with Professor Porter, of a synopsis of the flora of Colorado, which was published ten years ago as one of the Hayden Geological Reports, has been in great demand, and has long been out of print. So that, as the preface states, "in the wonderful development of the decade since then lies the confidence that a more convenient book, covering a greater range, will be welcome to many."

French Student and Self-Instructor, and Ready Speaker Assistant. By Alfred Sardou. Boston: Carl Schoenhof.

ALTHOUGH as a rule the various "Self-Instructors" in the modern languages are merely catch-pennies for the ignorant, an exception must be made in favor of the work before us. In spite of the awkward title and overcharged title-page, the book is what it professes to be, a complete and condensed method for beginners as well as for advanced pupils. Of course the author has been obliged to have recourse to some method of transcription for the French sounds. Those who know how difficult it is to transmit or to acquire these even with all the help of oral instruction, may smile to see "Vous ne voulez pas de pommes de terre" represented by *Voon—voo-lay pahd pom duh tair;* but it must be admitted that M. Sardou has done his best to overcome the impossible. He is careful throughout in his representation of the unaccented *e*, and of the linkings and grouping of words. The treatment of the pure diphthongs, in such words as *bien, juin,* is not quite satisfactory. The book is in five parts, bound in three volumes, but it very much needs an index to make it really useful to an unaided learner. The grammatical portions are clear and the diagrams well arranged. The conversational parts are progressive and comprehensive, with an extensive, well-chosen vocabulary, graceful and varied constructions, useful phrases, interesting allusions to Paris, and incidental explanations of French customs.

Our Young Folks' History of the Roman Empire. By William Shepard. Illustrated. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1885. 8vo, pp. 478.

MR. SHEPARD has told the story of the Roman Empire in a manner well adapted to interest the young people for whom his book is designed. He has the art of entertaining without sacrificing the "dignity of history"—a quality which is worth maintaining, after all. The book is excellently printed, too, in good clear type; but we cannot praise the illustrations, very few of which have any historical merit. They are for the most part "made-up" pictures, composed with neither knowledge nor imagination. In this the book is neither worse nor better than most histories written for the young. We shall continue to protest against this style of illustration—which does not illustrate—until publishers begin to have some conception of what their duty is in the matter. The account given by Mr. Shepard is for the most part the traditionary one, and does not indicate any familiarity with the latest results of scholarship. We would not, of course, burden a book for children with the details of recondite learning; but even children have a right to be told the truth, and not to be put off with exploded fables. They ought not, for instance, to be told (p. 44) of Tiberius that "he was mean and cruel, and wicked enough to sacrifice anybody that stood in the way of his ambition. But he knew how to hide his real character under a cloak of pretended meekness and humility." Now Tiberius was not mean, but throughout his reign displayed a wise liberality. Neither was there any pretence of meekness in him—humility, perhaps, whether pretended or not we will not undertake to say. Even cruelty, as a characteristic, it is hardly fair to attribute to a man who displayed no traces of it up to the age of nearly seventy. The summing up of Tiberius's character (p. 91), and the comparison of him with Augustus, are on the whole very fair. But the statement (p. 44) that Agrippa Postumus (not *Posthumus*) was slain by his order, has not a particle of evidence in its favor. The word *princeps*, spelled correctly on page 27, is three times printed *principus* on page 68. On the same page

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is incorrectly stated that the Senate wished to call Tiberius *Dominus*. On page 284 Ctesiphon is spelled Otesiphon.

First Year of Scientific Knowledge. By Paul Best. Pp. 344. 8vo. Paris: A. Colin & Cie.; New York: Christern. 1885.

THE well-known French ex-Minister of Public Instruction owes much of his popular reputation to a little book which he prepared on the rudiments of Natural History and what used to be called Natural Philosophy, for the use of children. This book, we are informed, is in use in all French schools of the lower grades, and many editions have been sold. An English edition has been issued, printed in France, and translated by Mme. Bert, who is a Scotchwoman. For children and beginners in general it is, of course, necessary to sketch such matters in broad outlines without regard to minor detail. This being understood, we find the book well adapted in plan and contents for its purpose. It treats of animals, plants, stones, and soils, elementary physics and chemistry, animal and, lastly, vegetable physiology. It is clearly printed and fully illustrated. It will require a certain amount of intelligence in the teacher, whose relation, in French schools, to his scholars is more intimate than in most of our public grammar schools; but there is nothing which is not clearly set forth, and nothing to which the most fastidious could take exception. The illustrations are good, but so small that some of them are rather obscure. The translation is now and then defective in giving the French rather than the real English equivalent for a French word, but not sufficiently so to constitute a serious fault. We have no work which fills the place this is intended for, and should be glad to see this one in general use.

Elementary Algebra for Schools. Hall and Knight. Macmillan. 1885. Pp. 308.

THE authors of this book have had an experience of twelve years in fitting pupils for the army and university examinations, and the result is that they are convinced that algebra can be most easily studied in an order different from the most logical order. There is always a strong presumption that a subject will be most readily taken in by a youthful mind in the order in which it actually had its rise. Algebra was from the beginning the science of the equation. Complicated operations in fractions and in factoring were only subsidiary to the solution of the equation; there is no reason why they should be forced upon the rebellious student at a time when he sees no reason for their existence. We have no doubt that these authors are quite right in putting the easy and interesting parts of algebra first, and that the student will make quite the most rapid progress in this way. His tender reasoning powers, which have remained wholly unexercised in arithmetic as usually taught, should not be subjected to too sudden and severe a strain when he first enters upon a real branch of mathematics.

The book contains an excellent collection of examples—3,500 in number.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Bert, Paul. First Year of Scientific Knowledge. Translated from the French by the author's wife. London: Relfe Bros.
Felch, I. K. Poultry Culture. Chicago: W. H. Harrison, jr. $1.50.
Frank, H. The Skeleton and the Rose, and Gems by the Wayside. Brentano Bros.
Murray, J. E. Essential Lessons in English Composition, Analysis, and Grammar. Philadelphia: J. E. Potter & Co. 75 cents.
Morison, J. C. Madame de Maintenon: An Étude. Scribner & Welford. 50 cents.
O'Meara, Kathleen. Madame Mohl: Her Salon and her Friends. Boston: Roberts Bros. $2.50.
Robertson, C. F. The Louisiana Purchase in its Influence upon the American System. [Papers of the American Historical Association. Vol I. No. 4.] G. P. Putnam's Sons. 50 cents.
Saintsbury, G. Marlborough. [English Worthies Series. Edited by Andrew Lang.] D. Appleton & Co. 75 cents.
Savage, M. J. Evolution and Religion from the Standpoint of one who Believes in Both. Philadelphia: G. H. Buchanan & Co. 25 cents.
Scott, Sir W. The Talisman. Edited by Dwight Holbrook. [Classics for Children.] Boston: Ginn & Co. 60 cents.
Scherer, W. A History of German Literature. Translated from the Third German edition by Mrs. F. C. Conybeare. Edited by Max Müller. Charles Scribner's Sons. 2 vols. $3.50.
Smith, W. R. Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan & Co. $2.50.
Schücking, L. Lebenserinnerungen. 2 vols. Leipzig: S. Schottlaender.
Sidgwick, H. The Scope and Method of Economic Science. Macmillan & Co. 60 cents.
Shedd, W. G. T. The Doctrine of Endless Punishment. Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.50.
Stebbins, Genevieve. Delsarte System of Dramatic Expression. E. S. Werner. $2.
Stephen, L. Life of Henry Fawcett. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $3.
Stickney, J. H. A Child's Version of Æsop's Fables. Classics for Children. Boston: Ginn & Co. 40 cents.
Stephen, Leslie. Dictionary of National Biography. Vol. V. Macmillan & Co. $3.35.
Stevenson, R. L. Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.
Spencer, Herbert. Ecclesiastical Institutions; Part IV. of the Principles of Sociology. D. Appleton & Co. $1.25.
Sorel, A. L'Europe et la Révolution française. Paris: Plon; Boston: Schoenhof.
Stryker, M. W. Christian Chorals for the Chapel and Fireside. Biglow & Main.
Tate, T. The Philosophy of Education, or the Principles and Practice of Teaching. E. L. Kellogg & Co.
Tennyson, Lord. Tiresias, and Other Poems. Harper & Bros. 25 cents.
Thayer, S. H. Songs of Sleepy Hollow, and Other Poems. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1.25.
Thayer, S. H. Songs of Sleepy Hollow. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1.25.
Thompson, Sir H. Food and Feeding. 4th ed. Frederick Warne & Co. $1.25.
The Broken Shaft: Tales in Mid-Ocean. Edited by Henry Norman. D. Appleton & Co. 25 cents.
Varley, J. P. Sylvian, a Tragedy; and Poems. Brentano Bros. $1.25.
Worthington, Sophie. Under the Apple Trees. Phillips & Hunt. $1.
Waite, H. R. College Songs. Boston: Oliver Ditson & Co.
Walker, J. S. Landlords' and Tenants' Guide for New York: Walker & Co. 50 cents.
Werkmeister, Maria. Vergebens: A Romance. Chicago: The Franz Gindele Printing Co.
Zeller, Dr. E. Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy. Translated. Henry Holt & Co. $1.75.

Fine Arts.

AMERICAN WATER-COLOR SOCIETY.

THE Water-Color Exhibition is always one of the pleasantest picture shows of the year, and the nineteenth annual exhibition, now open at the National Academy, is no exception to the rule. The white and gold frames and the pale colors are always agreeable in general effect; and, for the same reason that it is almost impossible for any work, however good, to detach itself from the others and make a powerful effect, it is equally difficult for any work, however bad, to impose its badness upon one in the imperious fashion of some bad oil pictures. There is a common notion that water-color painting is an easier art than painting in oil, which is expressed in the old rhyme:

La peinture à l'huile
Est bien difficile,
Mais c'est beaucoup plus beau
Que la peinture à l'eau.

But the truth is that the facility of water-color is in its difficulty. The difficulty of attaining full tone or elaborate modelling in water-color approaches impossibility, and the result is that, when they are wise, water-color painters hardly attempt these qualities at all, but confine themselves to the rapid and facile sketching which is easily within the powers of the material. For the greater number there is safety in this limitation of aims, and therefore, while one seldom sees a very impressive work in an exhibition of water colors, one is seldom shocked by the atrocity of failure attained by bad painters in oil.

These remarks apply more particularly to pure wash drawing, or what is generally known as "legitimate water color," and less strictly to gouache or distemper. Why these latter are more or less "legitimate" modes of working it is hard to see, but they are different, and have only deadness of surface, and consequent paleness of color, in common with pure water color. The most prominent examples of opaque water-color work in the present exhibition are certainly Mr. Chase's two large distemper paintings. One hears some murmuring against them as not "legitimate" water colors, but surely, if Mr. Chase finds the material suited to his aims, he has a perfect right to employ it, and since there is no special exhibition for works in gouache and distemper it would seem that the hanging committee have done well to stretch a point, rather than to deprive the public of a view of two works of such importance. The larger of the two, "A Summer Afternoon in Holland," is one of the very best things Mr. Chase has done, and, apart from some questionable drawing in hands and ankles, is almost entirely satisfactory. The justness of observation and sureness of eye and hand displayed in it are quite wonderful, and as a study of light (and that is undoubtedly what Mr. Chase intended it for) it would be hard to imagine it bettered. The absolute truth of relation between the broad shadow and the glowing spots of sunlight, and the dazzling play of reflections among the tea-things, are specially remarkable, and scarcely less so is the translucent green of the foliage overhead. Mr. Chase's other contribution, the "Madrid Dancing-Girl," is much less interesting, having little of the swing and movement that the subject requires, and comparatively little charm of color. Is it possible that at its perspective distance the fan upon the stool (or is it a table?) should appear so large?

If these are the most important examples of opaque water color in the exhibition, Mr. Abbey's "Old Song" is certainly the most important example of transparent water color to be found there. It is Mr. Abbey's "old song"—the song we all know so well and do not tire of—full of gentle refinement and sweetness, and only better sung than ever. Mr. Abbey is evidently constantly increasing in technical mastery, and apart from its beauty as a picture this is as fine a piece of water-color painting as one could wish to see.

An importance of another sort, the importance of a very celebrated name, belongs to Detaille's large military picture — an importance only partially justified by the actual performance. The composition is confused, the color unpleasant, and the values are non-existent. There are many things in the exhibition by young Americans which are better in everything but drawing than the work of this too celebrated Frenchman. His drawing is indeed sound and good, but even that is somewhat uninteresting and mechanical, and he seems to owe his fame largely to the choice of subject which flatters French pride and love of military glory.

There are 846 numbers in the catalogue, and it is inevitable that in reviewing such a mass of work one should have many sins of omission to answer for. Abandoning any attempt at much system, we will note here and there such works as for any reason have attracted our attention.

Mr. Weir has six contributions in the exhibition, mostly flower pieces in his well-known manner. They are, as ever, very handsome in sober tone—exquisite in color, though approaching almost to black and white—and they are also, as ever, rather formless. One could desire to see flowers better drawn, but scarcely to see them better painted.

Mr. Murphy has a number of his facile and not very profound landscapes, of which perhaps the best is entitled "November." The distance in this picture contains more nature than most of his work, and is very handsome in color, but the left-hand side of the picture is decidedly artificial. To the artificial style of landscape belong also Mr. Crane's numerous contributions, with their thin trees which grow altogether too

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cleverly. Mr. Bolton Jones has a landscape of his usual type, well and solidly done, without much emotion; and Mr. Tryon, a quiet-toned "November," which, while it will not add to his reputation, will take nothing from it. Other landscapes we have noticed are a charming, tapestry-like little picture by Mrs. S. N. Carter; a queer, dark little "Woods Near Cedarhurst," by Oliver H. Perry, which would give more assurance of talent if its companion were not so bad; a couple of gray, pastel-like compositions by C. Melville Dewey; a quiet "Evening," by W. Dodge MacKnight; a handsome black-and-yellow "Low Tide," by Ross Turner; a good little "Moonlight," by W. A. Coffin, in the vein of an oil picture recently seen at the Union League Club; a good, low-toned "Sandy Hook," by G. H. McCord; a strange black and green picture, by B. R. Fitz; a "May Twilight," with a white heifer in it, by C. Morgan McIlhenney; a vague and misty "Morning in Acadia," by Horatio Walker, very handsome; the "Bank of the Georges River," by Charles Copeland; a "Water-Mill," by Edward A. Bell, and several drawings by William J. Whittemore.

Mr. Smedley has two figure subjects, entitled respectively "June" and "November," which are marked by his usual quiet refinement, but perhaps by a little less than his usual power. Subjects of a similar sort are treated by Mr. Dielman and Mr. C. Y. Turner, in neither case with any great success. Mr. Turner's picture is of much the same color and texture throughout, and Mr. Dielman's, though pretty and pleasant, is rather spotty in technique. Mr. Church's two drawings are of his usual vagueness, and perhaps have a little less than his usual charm.

Mr. Weldon's "Incense" is conceived somewhat in the spirit of Louis Leloir's work. The almost insuperable difficulty of modelling nude flesh in water color has been too great for him. He has tried to overcome it by recourse to stippling, and the result is the rather disagreeably red and speckled look that nude flesh generally has in water-color paintings, and which Mr. Maynard, in his otherwise charming "Bather," has not been able to avoid. Mr. Millet and Mr. Blashfield are also represented by classical figure subjects. The architectural background of Mr. Blashfield's little drawing is excellent, but the figure is rather less carefully drawn than we should expect from him, and the bright red shadows of the drapery are surely impossible. Mr. Quartley has an excellent little figure subject, "Washing Pilchards"; Mr. Lippincott, a pale-colored landscape with figures, which is pretty and pleasing, and Leon and Percy Moran have several of their clever but ill-drawn productions. One of the best things in the exhibition in its way is a little head of a "Barbizon Peasant," by Theodore Robinson, in an oblong decorative panel. Some clever sketchy heads are signed by Elizabeth Nourse, and Mr. Beckwith sends also a head which is very charming.

Mr. Blum's "Sister's Advice" comes from Holland, and shows in a very interesting way the effect of the Dutch masters upon his brilliant talent. There is much delightful work in it, and it is none the less delightful for the tempering and added soberness that have come to him from his present surroundings. From Holland also come some fine and sober interiors by H. Keever. Mr. John Johnstone has sent two rather curious attempts at the fiery coloring of La Farge.

Mr. E. D. Boit sends a couple of his brilliant sketches of Parisian street scenes; Mr. Charles A. Platt, a good view of the "Quay at Honfleur"; Mr. Childe Hassam, a very clever beach scene at Scheveningen; and Mr. Nico Bastert an excellent little "Still-life."

As usual, the quaintest things in the exhibition are signed by William Walton. Mr. Walton's ideas are always so out of the way and so original, and there is such an evident sincerity in his strange way of carrying them out, that we always enjoy his work, with an enjoyment certainly different in kind but not unequal in degree to that which we receive from work of infinitely greater technical accomplishment.

A word in closing about titles. One exhibitor actually calls his picture, "It is as if the pine trees called me from ceiled room and silent books to see the dance of woodland shadow and hear the song of summer brooks"! Another—a lady, this one—calls hers "Roses that gave out their odorous souls in an ecstatic death"; and there are others nearly as bad. When will some of our artists learn that one must put his poetry into the picture and not into the title, and that a Corot is no whit less poetic for being called simply a "landscape," and a mediocre performance no more than mediocre though it have a yard of poetry tacked to it like a tail to a kite?

Henry Holt & Co.,

29 West 23d St., New York,

PUBLISH SATURDAY:

One of the two remaining Posthumous Novels

OF

Hugh Conway.

A Cardinal Sin.

By the Late F. J. Fargus. 16mo, Leisure Hour Series, $1; Leisure Moment Series, 30 cents.

OTHER WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR:

Leisure Moment Series (Paper Covers).	Slings and Arrows, etc.	30 cts.
	A Family Affair	30 "
	Carriston's Gift, etc.	30 "
	Bound Together (tales)	30 "
	Dark Days	25 "
	Called Back	25 "

*** All the above may be had in a style fit for the library at $1 each in the *Leisure Hour Series.*

Massage and Swedish Movements

Given by MISS ANNIE TOWNSEND
(Pupil of Dr. Douglas Graham),
70 Dennis St. Roxbury, Mass.

1841. S. DAVIS, JR.'S 1841.

DIAMOND HAMS,

CINCINNATI.

"They well sustain their ancient renown."—From a patron of 1842. Washington City, Feb. 24, 1872.
Sold by leading Grocers, who have circulars how to cook hams.

FOR SALE.—A copy of Pertz's Monumenta Germaniæ Historica, complete as far as yet published; thirty volumes folio and quarto series. Address Box 1283, Boston P. O.

FOR SALE.—A File of the Richmond (Va.) Daily Dispatch, in four bound volumes, running from February 6, 1861, to April 3, 1865.
G. A. BARKSDALE, Gallego Mills, Richmond, Va.

ROBERTS BROTHERS' NEW BOOKS.

Zeph.

A posthumous story by HELEN JACKSON (H. H.), author of 'Ramona,' 'A Century of Dishonor,' 'Bits of Talk,' 'Bits of Travel,' etc. One volume. 16mo. Cloth. Price, $1.25.

The lamented author of 'Ramona' was writing 'Zeph' when her fatal sickness seized her, and one of her latest acts was its hasty completion before sending the MS. to her publishers.

Madame Mohl:

HER SALON AND HER FRIENDS. A study of social life in Paris. By KATHLEEN O'MEARA. A very lively and charming book, the memoirs of a gracious, odd little figure, conspicuous both in Paris and London, and who had many friends among travelled Americans. With a likeness from a sketch by WM. W. STORY, and one from a portrait by herself, and a fac-simile letter. One volume. Crown 8vo. Cloth, gilt top. Price, $2.50.

A Short History of Napoleon the First.

By Professor J. R. SEELEY, of the University of Cambridge, England, author of 'Ecce Homo,' etc. With a superb steel-engraved portrait and two views of the head of Napoleon from a cast taken after death. One volume. 16mo. Cloth. Price, $1.50.

Rachel.

By NINA H. KENNARD. The eleventh volume in the Famous Women Series, being a life of the celebrated French Tragedienne, Rachel Félix. 16mo. Cloth. Price, $1.00.

Our Little Ann.

A Story. By the author of 'Tip Cat,' 'Miss Toosey's Mission,' and 'Laddie.' 16mo. Cloth. Price, $1.00.

Sold everywhere. Mailed, postpaid, by the publishers,

ROBERTS BROTHERS,
Boston.

CRITICAL AND SOCIAL ESSAYS.—Reprinted from the *Nation*, and in some measure supplying the place of the first two volumes of the paper, now very scarce. Cloth, 12mo, price $1.50. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of price.
HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

NEW BOOKS:

GEORGE ELIOT'S COMPLETE

Works. Édition de Luxe.

The first fine library edition ever issued. This edition will contain all the author's novels, essays, and poems, and a concise biography by the Rev. Geo. Willis Cooke.
It will be embellished with a series of proof impressions of entirely original painter-etchings and photo-etchings. Among the artists who will contribute to the work may be mentioned Frederick Dielman, F. S. Church, Wm. Unger, Will H. Low, J. Wells Champney, George Fuller, H. Sandham, W. St. John Harper, Walter Satterlee, W. L. Taylor, E. H. Garrett, F. T. Merrill, S. A. Schoff, S. G. McCutcheon, J. Henry Hill, and others.
The Text will be printed from new electrotype plates made and printed at the celebrated University Press at Cambridge.
The paper will be of the finest quality of parchment linen drawing paper, uniform in size and quality with that of the *édition de luxe* of Carlyle issued by us.
Complete in 12 volumes, 8vo; price per vol., $6. Edition limited to 500 numbered copies.

THE COMPLETE POETICAL WORKS OF

PERCY BYSSHE SHELLEY.

The text carefully revised, with Notes and a Memoir, by William Michael Rossetti. This special limited edition will consist of fifty copies, each copy numbered. 3 vols., 8vo, cloth, gilt tops, and illustrated with a frontispiece on India paper, $10.50.

"Mr. Rossetti's edition takes a prominent place among works of modern criticism. His investigation of original sources, where they were accessible, has been most painstaking, and the recovery of many a lost Shelleyan pearl is due to his zeal."—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

"This will in future be *the* edition of 'the imperishable poems'"—*Liverpool Daily Post.*

"This edition will be welcomed as a great advance on Mr. Rossetti's former labors in Shelley's magnificent poetry."—*Daily Telegraph.*

THE EARLY HANOVERIANS.

A new volume of the Epochs of Modern History. By Edward E. Morris, Professor of English in the University of Melbourne. With Maps and Plans. 1 vol., 16mo, cloth, $1.

The above will be for sale by all booksellers, or sent, postpaid, on receipt of price by the publishers,

ESTES & LAURIAT,
Boston, Mass.

A General Index to the Nation.

Vol. I.—From July, 1865, to September, 1880. $2.50.
Vol. II.—From October, 1880, to October, 1885. $1.25.
No trade or other discounts. Purchasers will please remit with order. Address Publisher of the *Nation*, Box 794 New York or Q. P. INDEX Bangor, Maine.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED